

CHAPTER IV

FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

A. Findings

In this chapter, the researcher presents the result of what being exist at SMA Wachid Hasyim 2 regarding to the current research. Based on the research questions of this study, the researcher needed to get the data of 3 sub-categories in relation to the Multiple Intelligence: Students' Multiple Intelligence Profiles, the Profile of Supplementary Book (Buku Penunjang) and the Profile of Students' Workbook (Lembar Kerja Siswa). These categories was gathered by the researcher correspond to the methodology of this research and was referred to the first graders of intensive classes i.e. X-1 as the subject of this research.

1. Students' MI Profiles

The data was found that the students were between 14-15 of ages among 39 students at class X-1. Since the questionnaire was given to students, the researcher had analyzed and obtained the data of Multiple Intelligence at Intensive Classes of SMA Wachid Hasyim 2 Taman. The scores of students' responses on each type of intelligence were identified indicating the strengths and weaknesses of each student. In this case, the MI profiles of each student were found through calculating scores for each type of intelligence so that the degrees of seven kinds of intelligence of

individuals were identified¹. When the profiles of individuals were found, it enabled for the researcher to determine the MI profiles of students at this class through calculating the degree of each type of intelligence among students by presenting the frequencies. Hence, the highest percentage was considered as the most predominant intelligence among students.

The following table describes the rank of students' Multiple Intelligence Profiles gathered through the questionnaire. As can be seen at the table below, the seven kinds of intelligence are ranked based on the frequencies from the highest to the lower percentage. In this case, interpersonal intelligence ranks first among students. At least 12 of 39 students or 30.77% students at class X-1 have strong interpersonal intelligence. This means that interpersonal intelligence is the most predominant intelligence at this class. Intrapersonal and musical intelligence are the second and the third rank. These two kinds of intelligence have the same percentage in which 9 of 39 students have strong intrapersonal intelligence and so it is with musical intelligence. Meanwhile, bodily-kinesthetic intelligence ranks fourth with the percentage of 20.51%. This frequency was lower than the second and the third ranks just about 3% and it also applies for logical-mathematical intelligence which has 17.95%. Logical-mathematical intelligence ranks fifth and was followed by linguistic and spatial-visual intelligence in the last ranks. Linguistic and spatial-visual intelligence have the same percentage i.e. 2.56% or 1 of 39 students at class X-1 has

¹ see *Appendix D*

linguistic/spatial-visual intelligence. The table below presents the students' Multiple Intelligence Profiles respectively based on the percentage.

Table 4.1
Students' MI Profiles

MI Profiles of Class X-1		
Rank	MI Types	Percentage (%)
1	Interpersonal Intelligence	30.77
2	Intrapersonal Intelligence	23.08
3	Musical Intelligence	23.08
4	Bodily-kinesthetic Intelligence	20.51
5	Logical-mathematical Intelligence	17.95
6	Linguistic Intelligence	2.56
7	Spatial-visual Intelligence	2.56

Overall, the table shows the rank of seven kinds of intelligence owned by students of class X-1. The range is between 2.56 and 30.77 of percentage from the highest to the lowest frequencies. The most predominant intelligences are interpersonal, intrapersonal, and musical intelligence. Bodily-kinesthetic and logical-mathematical intelligences are less-dominant. Meanwhile, the least predominant

intelligences are linguistic and spatial-visual intelligence. As the students knew their own intelligences, they seemed to be impressed of what they found since the results of their profiles of intelligence really described themselves in terms of language learning. They confirmed that the scores of each type of intelligence reflected their own preferences well.

2. MI Profiles of Supplementary Book

ENGLISH ZONE for Senior High School Students Year X published by Erlangga, Jakarta in 2010 is a supplementary book used by first graders at class X-1 intensive SMA Wachid Hasyim 2 Taman Sidoarjo. The book arranged by Eka Mulya Astuti contains 182 pages and has 6 units; each of which contains two or three lessons. Meanwhile, the researcher had evaluated 206 tasks/activities in this supplementary book in terms of MI theory. The result of supplementary book evaluation is summarized in table 4.2.

Table 4.2

MI Profiles of Supplementary Book

Supplementary Book (Buku Penunjang)		
Rank	MI Types	Percentage (%)
1	Linguistic Intelligence	99.5
2	Logical-mathematical Intelligence	44.2

3	Interpersonal Intelligence	28.2
4	Spatial-visual Intelligence	16.0
5	Bodily-kinesthetic Intelligence	9.2
6	Intrapersonal Intelligence	8.7
7	Musical Intelligence	0

The table shows that the most predominant intelligence of supplementary book is linguistic and logical-mathematical intelligence. Linguistic intelligence ranks first since almost all the activities in supplementary book catered for language skills; Listening, Speaking, Reading and Writing. The researcher found that 205 of 206 (99.5%) activities in the supplementary book were addressed to linguistic intelligence. The other activity was not included since it only asked students to draw one's appearance and did not enable the students to perform their language skills. Meanwhile, logical-mathematical intelligence ranks second and has 44.2% of frequency. This means that 91 of 206 activities in this book addressed to logical-mathematical intelligence. The third and fourth ranks are interpersonal and spatial-visual intelligence. At least 58 of 206 activities catered for interpersonal intelligence or 28.2% of percentage. Whereas, spatial-visual intelligence has 16% of percentage or 19 activities addressed to this type of intelligence. The remaining rank is bodily-kinesthetic, intrapersonal and musical intelligence respectively. Bodily-kinesthetic

intelligence has 9.2% of frequency. Intrapersonal intelligence has a lower grade than bodily-kinesthetic intelligence that is to say 8.7%. Musical intelligence ranks lowest among all types of intelligence since there were no activities which cater for this kind of intelligence.

3. MI Profiles of Students' Workbook

After doing the evaluation of supplementary book in terms of MI theory, the researcher then focused on evaluation of students' workbook which was arranged by Nuning Widyaningsih, S. S. and entitled LKS Bahasa Inggris KREATIF (Kreasi Belajar Siswa Aktif) SMA/MA Kelas X for odd semester. This book was published by Penerbit Viva Pakarindo Klaten, Middle Java. It contained 80 pages and was divided into 5 units. There were 79 activities which excluded "*summary/grammar review*", "*test/evaluation in each unit*", and "*final test*" on the textbook evaluation. Table 4.3 presents the result of students' workbook evaluation in the light of MI theory.

Table 4.3
MI Profiles of Students' Workbook

Students' Workbook (Lembar Kerja Siswa)		
Rank	MI Types	Percentage (%)
1	Linguistic Intelligence	100
2	Logical-mathematical Intelligence	43.0
3	Interpersonal Intelligence	16.5
4	Bodily-kinesthetic Intelligence	13.9
5	Spatial-visual Intelligence	10.1
6	Intrapersonal Intelligence	6.3
7	Musical Intelligence	0

The result above is almost the same as supplementary book. Linguistic and logical-mathematical intelligence was the most predominant intelligence of students' workbook. The table shows the rank from the highest to the lowest frequency which considers linguistic intelligence in the first rank and musical intelligence in the last rank. In this book, all activities catered for linguistic intelligence since the activities enabled students to perform their language skills. Logical-mathematical intelligence had 43% of frequency inside the students' workbook. This type of intelligence ranks

second in which at least 34 of 79 activities addressed to logical-mathematical intelligence. Interpersonal intelligence ranks third with 16.5% or 13 activities. The next rank is bodily-kinesthetic and spatial-visual intelligence respectively. The percentage was lower about 3% between them; bodily-kinesthetic intelligence was 13.9% and spatial-visual intelligence was 10.1%. Meanwhile, at least 5 of 79 activities appeared to intrapersonal intelligence. The frequency of this type of intelligence was 6.3%. Whereas, no activities in the students' workbook which catered for musical intelligence so that the frequency of this type of intelligence was 0% as can be seen in the supplementary book.

B. Discussion

As can be seen in the previous section, the researcher described some findings at SMA Wachid Hasyim 2 Taman Sidoarjo regarding to the current study. Conclusively, the researcher found that the Multiple Intelligence Profiles of first graders at Intensive Class that is to say class X-1 at SMA Wachid Hasyim 2 Taman Sidoarjo were interpersonal intelligence, intrapersonal intelligence, and musical intelligence respectively. On the other hand, the textbooks used by students were analyzed in order to evaluate in the light of MI theory to conclude whether the supplementary book and students' workbook cater for students' Multiple Intelligence Profiles.

Initially, the data of students' Multiple Intelligence Profiles were gathered from the students' responses on each item in a questionnaire. The questionnaires were

identified by the researcher to determine the most predominant intelligence and the less common intelligence. The result distributed a wide range of seven intelligences, 2.56% - 30.77%. As shown in table 4.1, the most predominant intelligence was interpersonal intelligence among the students. The percentage of students possessing interpersonal intelligence was 30.77%. It was reasonable since most students at this class gave a good response to the statement on item 19; *I am a very social person and like being with other people*” and the other items in the questionnaire regarding to the characteristics of interpersonal intelligence². In this case, the statements in the questionnaire represented the theory of Howard Gardner in which the interpersonal intelligence looks outward, toward the behavior, feelings, and motivations of others³. This theory implied that 30.77 % of students had understood on how other people feel, like or dislike, how individual likes being with other people, and how some other people come for emotional support and advice. As this type of intelligence was the most predominant, it indicated that these students have the ability to notice and make distinctions among other individuals and, in particular, among their moods, temperaments, motivations, and intentions⁴.

Meanwhile, these students were also having good intrapersonal and musical intelligences. The percentages of intrapersonal and musical intelligences were 23.08%. It can be seen that 23.08 % of the students agreed with item 56; *I am realistic about my*

² Listed on *Appendix B*

³ Howard Gardner, *Frames of Mind; The Theory of Multiple Intelligences* (New York: Basic Books, 2011), 255.

⁴ *Ibid*, 253.

strengths and weaknesses. This statement was in the respect of Gardner's theory that there is the development of the internal aspects of a person. The core capacity at work here is access to one's own feeling life⁵. This internal aspect includes knowledge of one's own strengths and weaknesses. The other statements in the questionnaire were also addressed to intrapersonal intelligence because they evaluated students' self-knowledge, self-awareness and self-understanding⁶. They were adequately well-responded by 23.08 % of students at this class. In this case, having a strong intrapersonal intelligence allows students to successfully navigate situations to capitalize on strengths and minimize some weaknesses. The intrapersonal is the key intelligence. More than any other intelligence, a strong intrapersonal intelligence positions learners for success. Conversely, a weak intrapersonal intelligence likely means that someone will continue to meet frustration and failure⁷.

On the other hand, 23.08 % of students agreed with the statement; *At school, I loved/love music lessons*⁸. This frequency was obtained from students who gave good responses on such statement and the other statements regarding to the characteristics of musical intelligence. In the questionnaire, students had responded to some statements focusing on musical intelligence to evaluate their abilities to play musical instrument, to sing in wide variety of musical styles and to know how music represent their feelings

⁵ *Ibid.*,

⁶ See *appendix B*

⁷ Thomas R. Hoerr, *Becoming A Multiple Intelligences School*. (Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 2000), 43.

⁸ Item 51, see *appendix B*

emotionally. This means that 23.08 % of students at this class can use their musical intelligences to perceive, discriminate, transform, and express musical forms. This intelligence includes sensitivity to the rhythm, pitch or melody, and timbre or tone color of a musical piece⁹. In conclusion, the researcher reported that interpersonal, intrapersonal, and musical intelligence were the most predominant intelligence among students. The combination of interpersonal and intrapersonal intelligence would run the chance of success since Russell Elementary School Kentucky and Mountlake Terrace High School Washington had featured specific interpersonal and intrapersonal skills to build good social and academic behaviors for each individual¹⁰.

Meanwhile, bodily-kinesthetic intelligence was less common among students since the percentage was 20.51%. In this case, 20.51 % of students at class X-1 responded to the statements regarding to bodily-kinesthetic intelligence especially on item 7; *I have always been very co-ordinated*. As stated by Adrianna Kezar, bodily-kinesthetic intelligence relates to the ability to use the skillfully and handle objects adroitly¹¹. Playing sports, dancing to express feelings, making things with hands, and doing something physical were some examples of body usage. In this case, there were other

⁹ Thomas Armstrong, *Multiple Intelligences in The Classroom; 2nd Edition*. (Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 2000), 2.

¹⁰ Linda Campbell - Bruce Campbell, *Multiple Intelligences and Student Achievement: Success Stories from Six Schools*. (Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 1999), 94.

¹¹ Adrianna Kezar, "Theory of Multiple Intelligences: Implications for Higher Education". *Innovative Higher Education*, Vol. 26 No. 2 Winter 2001, 143

statements in relation to bodily-kinesthetic intelligence but not many students gave good responses to these statements.

Meanwhile, the same condition was happened to logical-mathematical intelligence. At least 17.95 % of the students responded well on item 20; *I like to be systematic and thorough*, and the other statements concerning to logical-mathematical intelligence¹². Since logical-mathematical intelligence represents the skill to use numbers effectively and reason well, the questionnaire had adequately evaluated students' abilities to recognize abstract patterns, to make predictions, to sequence, to solve problems, and to make scientific investigation¹³. Unfortunately, the researcher found that such type of intelligence was preferred by only 17.95% of the students at this class.

The two remaining intelligences were the least common among students with the same frequency, 2.56%. Linguistic intelligence was less-preferred since the items regarding to this type of intelligence were not well-responded by the students. For instance on item 6; *I find it easy to make up stories*, this statement was disagreed by most of the students. As stated by Masoumeh Mirzazadeh, linguistic intelligence represents the ability to use language masterfully to express oneself rhetorically or

¹² See *Appendix B*

¹³ Maria Do Rozario De Lima Botelho, Thesis for the Degree Master of Arts: "*Multiple Intelligences Theory in English Language Teaching: An Analysis of Current Textbooks, Materials and Teachers' Perceptions*" (Ohio: Ohio University, November 2003), 28.

poetically in speech and writing¹⁴. Certainly, using words, phrases, and sentences or quotes to make up stories were evidences of linguistic intelligence to use the language masterfully.

Likewise, a statement on item 21 in the questionnaire was included in spatial-visual intelligence; *I find graphs and charts easy to understand*. It was only 2.56 % of the students who agreed with this statement. On the contrary, the students mostly disagreed with this statement and did not give a good response to the similar statements related to spatial-visual intelligence. As cited by Karim Hajhashemi, Howard Gardner posited that this type of intelligence involves the ability to make accurate spatial judgments and mental visualizations of the world¹⁵. This theory was covered the statements regarding to spatial-visual intelligence in which students responses were identified whether they found easy to understand graphs, charts, maps, etc. At last, most students disagreed with such statements while at least 2.56 % of the students were found to have stronger spatial-visual intelligence.

Focusing on the Multiple Intelligence Profiles of supplementary book, it was found that linguistic intelligence was the most predominant intelligence among all activities in supplementary book. As shown in table 4.2, linguistic intelligence had 99.5% of frequency. In other words, almost all activities in the supplementary book

¹⁴ Masoumeh Mirzazadeh, "Impacts of Multiple Intelligences on Learning English in the ESL Classroom". (*American Journal of Scientific Research* 2012), 67.

¹⁵ Karim Hajhashemi, "The Relationship between Iranian EFL High School Students' Multiple Intelligence Scores and their Use of Learning Strategies". *Canadian Center of Science and Education* Vol. 4, No. 3; September 2011, 215.

addressed to this type of intelligence. This result was reasonable since every language textbook comprises skills like reading, writing, speaking and listening, as well as language areas such as grammar, pronunciation and vocabulary. Thus, the result of linguistic intelligence being the dominant intelligence type in the textbooks is expected and typical¹⁶.

For instance on Page 49 *Between The Lines A*, the instruction was *Read the following text to find out who invented band-aid*¹⁷. This instruction reflected an activity involving linguistic intelligence since students were stimulated to use their sensitivities to the meaning of the words, whereby an individual appreciates the subtle shades of difference between spilling ink “intentionally,” “deliberately,” or “on purpose”¹⁸. Students possessed this sensitivities in varying degree by which the ability to understand the passage differs among students. Indeed, such instruction comprises purposeful reading since students were asked to find out who invented band-aid. Likewise, an activity on Page 78 *Hear This Out A* was also included in linguistic intelligence because it engaged students’ sensitivities to use language through involving students’ abilities in listening and writing. The instruction was *Listen and write the instructions you hear next to the correct pictures*. From these examples, it was reasonable that most activities in

¹⁶ Nigera Ibragimova, Thesis for the Degree of Master of Arts in English Language Teaching: “*Multiple Intelligences Theory in Action in EFL Classes: A Case Study*” (Gazimağusa, North Cyprus: Eastern Mediterranean University, January 2011), 69.

¹⁷ See *Appendix G*

¹⁸ Howard Gardner, *Frames of Mind; The Theory of Multiple Intelligences* (New York: Basic Books, 2011), 81.

supplementary book were included in linguistic intelligence since every activity was found to be purposeful in arising students' abilities in language skills. However, an activity on page 129 was excluded in linguistic intelligence because the students were just asked to draw a figure explained in the previous task¹⁹. Therefore, 1 of 206 activities in supplementary book was not included in linguistic intelligence.

Logical-mathematical intelligence was the second highest dominant intelligence with 44.2% of frequency among all activities in supplementary book. This type of intelligence comprises grammar analysis and other activities which enable students to use their logics such as ordering, matching, classifying, identifying errors, etc. Therefore, some features, especially grammar focus in supplementary book, contribute mostly to this type of intelligence. It was reasonable to consider *Grammar Focus* in unit 1 lesson 2 as the examples of activities regarding to logical-mathematical intelligence²⁰. In this case, *Grammar Focus A* and *B* were guided by a table reviewing *Modals*. The table enabled the students to do the tasks based on the example mentioned. *Grammar Focus C* asked the students to match the sentences with the possible responses. These activities became the reflection of logical-mathematical intelligence by which the tasks enabled students to learn a language by using numbers, logic, calculations, and understanding grammatical rules²¹. Briefly, the mentioned activities on *Grammar Focus*

¹⁹ See *Appendix H*

²⁰ See *Appendix I*

²¹ H. Douglas Brown, “*Strategies for Success; A Practical Guide to Learning English*” (San Francisco State University: Longman, 2002), 38.

A-C were considered as activities which involved skill of calculations, logical interpretation, and problem solving.

The third rank was spatial-visual intelligence which had 16% of frequency. *Warm Up A* on Page 86 was an example of activity addressed to this type of intelligence²². As stated by Howard Gardner, central to spatial intelligence are the capacities to perceive the visual world accurately, to perform transformations and modifications upon one's initial perceptions, and to be able to re-create aspects of one's visual experience, even in the absence of relevant physical stimuli²³. The visual worlds included some pictures/drawings provided in such activity enabling the students to use their visualization to match them with the correct sentences they described. At last, the similar activities which provided visualization were found until 16 % of 206 activities in supplementary book.

Meanwhile, bodily-kinesthetic and intrapersonal intelligences ranked fourth and fifth with 9.2 % and 8.7 % of frequency respectively. *Speak up A* on page 145 was included in bodily-kinesthetic intelligence. The instruction was *Act out the following dialogues*²⁴. The students were asked to make actions and movements based on the figures in the dialogue as well as to play objects around them. To depict an object, for example, the mime has to delimit, by means of gestures, the shape of an object and to

²² See *Appendix J*

²³ Howard Gardner, *Frames of Mind; The Theory of Multiple Intelligences* (New York: Basic Books, 2011), 182.

²⁴ See *Appendix K*

denote, by means of facial expressions and bodily actions, what that object is doing and its effects upon him²⁵. Actions and body movement would become appealing if students played a good mime to certain figures. This activity reflected to the use of body and therefore was considered as a task addressed to bodily-kinesthetic intelligence. Meanwhile, intrapersonal intelligence had a little bit lower frequency than bodily-kinesthetic intelligence. At least 8.7 % of activities in supplementary book were addressed to intrapersonal intelligence. For instance, the instruction on *Easy Essay* Page 122 was *Write your own story based on the following pictures*²⁶. Based on this instruction, the researcher considered this activity as part of the implementation of intrapersonal intelligence since it related to the capacity of understanding one's desires, fears and other emotions. This intelligence involves self-reflection, self-awareness, self-consciousness, and introspection²⁷. By emphasizing to self-knowledge, it indicates that this activity and the other similar activities in supplementary book had an individualized instruction which enabled students to work on their own ways.

On the other hand, musical intelligence was the least dominant intelligence of this supplementary book since no activity addressed to this type of intelligence was found. In this case, supplementary book needs to attach some activities which involve the skills of expressing emotions and feelings through music as well as being sensitive to rhythm,

²⁵ *Ibid.*, 218

²⁶ See *Appendix L*

²⁷ Maria Do Rozario De Lima Botelho, Thesis for the Degree Master of Arts: "*Multiple Intelligences Theory in English Language Teaching: An Analysis of Current Textbooks, Materials and Teachers' Perceptions*" (Ohio: Ohio University, November 2003), 31.

pitch, timbre and tone. Activities such as singing in a good voice with tune and harmony, as well as humming or whistling a tune are related to musical intelligence. Also, writing lyrics and music in a song and playing musical instruments with ability are skills which musically intelligent individuals may have²⁸. This matter was reasonable because of the fact that students learn in different ways and have different degree on each type of intelligence so that it was very important for language textbooks to provide various activities which catered for seven types of intelligences.

Dealing with the profiles of supplementary book and students' Multiple Intelligences, the results indicated that there were many differences from each other. Both results differed from each other in terms of the ranking and the range of percentages. The range of supplementary book was between 0% and 99.5% whereas the students' MI profiles was between 2.56% and 30.77%. Therefore, the researcher concluded that either students' MI profiles or supplementary book was not balanced. Regarding to the ranking, both profiles did not indicate any similarities, even at one type of intelligence. But then, interpersonal intelligence was much better to cater for students' MI profiles than the others. While interpersonal intelligence was the most predominant intelligence among students, supplementary book provided at least 28.2% only in the third rank.

²⁸Carolina Leonardi De Oliveira, "*Coursebook and Multiple Intelligence Theory: An Analysis*". (Porto Alegre: Universidade Federal Do Rio Grande Do Sul, 2009), 27

Indeed, intrapersonal and musical intelligence ranked in unbalance way. Many students had strong intrapersonal and musical intelligence with 23.08% of frequency but there were only 8.7% activities which catered for intrapersonal intelligence and even 0% for musical intelligence. Conversely, linguistic and logical-mathematical intelligence were the most predominant among activities in supplementary book. But then, not many students had these types of intelligence. It was just 17.95% in the fifth rank of logical-mathematical intelligence and 2.56% of linguistic intelligence.

Overall, most students at this class were strong at interpersonal, intrapersonal and musical intelligence. On the other hand, the most predominant intelligences in supplementary book were linguistic and logical-mathematical intelligences. Therefore, it could be considered that supplementary book used by students showed inconsistency with students' MI profiles. According to Gardner, The theory of multiple intelligences may help us to understand better the reasons for the effectiveness—or the ineffectiveness—of various programs designed to help individuals realize their potentials²⁹. Unfortunately, most activities in the supplementary book used by students were not addressed to their MI profiles so that students may find difficulties to realize their ways in learning English.

Focusing on the students' workbook analysis, it was found that the result was almost the same with supplementary book. As previously mentioned, the result of

²⁹ Howard Gardner, *Frames of Mind; The Theory of Multiple Intelligences* (New York: Basic Books, 2011), 386.

linguistic intelligence being the dominant intelligence type in the textbooks was expected and typical. However, the frequency of linguistic intelligence in students' workbook was 100%. In other words, all activities in this book enabled students to use their four language-skills. Since the core features of linguistic intelligence include the ability to use words effectively for reading, writing and speaking³⁰, page 32 on *Task 1, 2* and *3* were addressed to this type of intelligence. The tasks enabled students to engage their language skills through listening to the dialogue, expressing attitudes orally, reading and practicing conversation and identifying the expression used³¹. Meanwhile, logical-mathematical intelligence ranked second with 43% of frequency. As an example, *Task 9* on page 23 instructed students to *Match the following words with the definitions*³². It was included in logical-mathematical intelligence whereby this activity represented the logical-mathematical ability, which is the ability to work with numbers and other logical systems in an effective way³³. By enhancing their logical systems, students were enabled to use their abilities to match some vocabularies with the correct definitions they described. In conclusion, linguistic and logical-mathematical intelligences were considered as the most predominant intelligence of students' workbook.

³⁰ Reza Rezvani & Tayebe Amiri, "Dominant Intelligences in ESP Textbooks: Multiple or Single?", (Yasouj University), 3.

³¹ See *Appendix M*

³² See *Appendix N*

³³ Carolina Leonardi De Oliveira, "Course Book and Multiple Intelligence Theory: An Analysis". (Porto Alegre: Universidade Federal Do Rio Grande Do Sul, 2009), 25.

On the other hand, interpersonal intelligence ranked third among all activities in students' workbook. The percentage of interpersonal intelligence was 16.5% of frequency. In this case, this type of intelligence was implemented in the form of group discussion attached in each unit of students' workbook. As stated by Howard Gardner, interpersonal intelligence is concerned with the capacity to understand the intentions, motivations and desires of other people. It allows people to work effectively with others³⁴. *Group Discussion* on page 41 enabled students to concern with the capacity to understand desires of other students and to make a cooperative learning with others³⁵. By doing this task, students were expected to be friendly and could get on well with others so that they could easily take part in social activities.

On the other hand, it was quite different with supplementary book in which bodily-kinesthetic and spatial-visual intelligences ranked fourth (13.9%) and fifth (10.1%) respectively. Bodily-kinesthetic intelligence was reflected on *Task 5* page 53 which enabled the students to make use of their bodies in a unique and talented way. The students could move and act, they were also able to achieve success in a class where physical activities and hands were provided³⁶. By practicing the conversation with their friends, students with stronger bodily-kinesthetic intelligence worked well to coordinate bodily movements. Otherwise, spatial-visual intelligence was found on *Task 8* page 23

³⁴ Derya Gogebakan, "How Students' Multiple Intelligences Differ in terms of Grade Level and Gender" (Middle East Technical University, 2003), 26.

³⁵ See *Appendix O*

³⁶ Derya Gogebakan, *op. cit.*, 25. See *Appendix P*

which enabled students to enhance students' sensitivities to the notion of space and drawings as visual elements³⁷. This task comprised any type of English learning activity that asked students to interpret visual information³⁸. It would be a very useful learning strategy when mental images were used systematically to work with reading comprehension.

Meanwhile, intrapersonal intelligence ranked sixth with 6.3% of frequency. It was considered as the least common intelligence among all activities in students' workbook. However, it was found to be included in this type of intelligence since *Task 11-12* on page 10 provided inner self-intelligence³⁹. As stated by Howard Gardner, this type of intelligence involves the capacity to understand oneself, to have an effective working model of oneself including one's own desires, fears and capacities⁴⁰. By working with one's own self, students were expected to use their own words to retell a monologue and to identify the moral of the stories provided in these tasks. Otherwise, no activities catered for musical intelligence were found (0%). This means that students with stronger musical intelligence would not find any activities which cater for their preferences.

In this case, if the profiles of students' workbook and students' MI profiles were compared, the results were found to be quite similar to the answers mentioned previously. While students were strong in interpersonal, intrapersonal and musical

³⁷ See *Appendix Q*

³⁸ Masoumeh Mirzazadeh, "Impacts of Multiple Intelligences on Learning English in the ESL Classroom". (*American Journal of Scientific Research* 2012), 68.

³⁹ See *Appendix R*

⁴⁰ Masoumeh Mirzazadeh, *op. cit.*, 70.

intelligence, students' workbook was dominant in linguistic and logical-mathematical intelligence with 100% and 43% respectively. This means that the students' workbook could not fully cater for students' MI profiles. It could be seen that the MI profile of students was inconsistent with the MI profile of students' workbook.

However, there seemed to be consistency with bodily-kinesthetic intelligence. This type of intelligence ranked third either in students' MI profiles or students' workbook. The percentage of students' MI profiles was 20.51% and students' workbook was 13.9%. In general, students' workbook showed inconsistency with students' MI profiles, except for the bodily-kinesthetic intelligence. Whereas, Multiple Intelligence is a student-centered model in which the curriculum is often modified to fit the students. Rather than relying upon a linguistic filter and requiring students to write to show their grasp of skills and information, teachers using MI can allow students to use their strengths to demonstrate what they have learned⁴¹. If so, students' workbook used by students was incompatible with the students' potential since it cannot cater for students' MI profiles.

⁴¹ Thomas R. Hoerr, *Becoming A Multiple Intelligences School*. (Virginia: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development, 2000), 5.