



The Relationship Between Functional Writing and Linguistic Intelligence: Validation and Correlation

العلاقة بين الكتابة الوظيفية والذكاء اللغوي: دراسة في التحقق والارتباط

Bothina Sayed Mahmoud Abdelsaheed 

Lecturer in Curriculum & Instruction Department, College of Education, New Valley University, New Valley, 75211, Egypt.

bothinashaheed@gmail.com

مدرس المناهج وطرق تدريس اللغة الإنجليزية، قسم المناهج وطرق التدريس ، كلية التربية،
جامعة الوادي الجديد

The Relationship Between Functional Writing and Linguistic Intelligence: Validation and Correlation

DR. Bothina Sayed Mahmoud Abdelsaheed

Abstract:

This research aimed to ascertain the level of Functional Writing (FW) skills and their correlation with LI (LI) among English as a Foreign Language (EFL) majors. Employing an analytical descriptive methodology, the study involved the development and validation of instruments, including lists of FW and LI skills, alongside corresponding tests. A group of 60 EFL Majors participated, with data collected and statistically analyzed. The study resulted in a final list of 28 FW skills categorized into six themes, and 20 LI skills categorized into 4 themes. The findings also indicated a moderate level of FW skills (56.69) and LI skills (56.04) among the students. Crucially, a positive correlational relationship ($r = 0.651$, $p = 0.001$, <0.05) was identified between students' mastery of FW skills and their LI level. This shows that English majors with stronger FW skills also tend to have stronger LI skills, and vice versa

Keywords: Functional Writing (FR), Linguistic Intelligence (LI), EFL majors

Introduction

Language serves as a cornerstone of human existence, underpinning communication, articulation of thought and emotion, and intergenerational transmission of cultures and scientific knowledge. Proficiency in any language fundamentally hinges upon mastery of its core skills: listening, speaking, reading, and writing. Among these, writing holds a uniquely pivotal position as a primary conduit for human interaction, enabling individuals to articulate complex ideas, sentiments, and requirements (Graham, 2006; Bangert-Drowns et al., 2004; Smyth, 1998). Its intrinsic nature offers a durable, precise, and asynchronous means of communication that transcends the immediate constraints of time and presence. Unlike fleeting spoken words, written text provides a permanent record, allowing for meticulous composition, careful revision, and subsequent review, which is essential for articulating complex ideas with clarity. Indeed, writing is widely regarded as one of the most profound intellectual achievements, functioning as an indispensable tool for the preservation and dissemination of heritage, as well as for meticulous recording and documentation (Graham et al., 2013).

Writing itself is an intricate cognitive process that demands the conceptualization and translation of ideas, the structured construction of phrases, sentences, and paragraphs, and the judicious selection of content appropriate for diverse communicative purposes. Moreover, it actively cultivates critical thinking and analytical abilities, given that effective written expression necessitates an expansive vocabulary, alongside the capacity for rigorous analysis, logical inference, and evaluative judgment (Rodríguez-Escobar & Saldías, 2025; Yamin et al., 2023). Concurrently, it functions as a fundamentally social activity, characterized by an implicit or explicit dialogue between the writers and readers, a dynamic further shaped by considerations of audience, purpose, cultural context, societal norms, and historical influences (Schultz & Fecho, 2000).

Within the broader spectrum of written communication, FW occupies a particularly prominent role. This happens as the concept of Functional Linguistics has emerged to describe the pragmatic use of the English language for various real-world personal and social purposes. Crucially, functional language operates within communicative interactions, aiming to exert specific, deliberate effects on the audience. This inherently links

it to the meaningful and practical application of language to fulfill defined communicative needs. First, it serves as a vital instrument for conveying internal thoughts and emotions, both at the individual and societal levels. The inability to articulate one's inner world or acquired knowledge through writing would significantly impede human functioning and societal progress. Second, it is thus recognized as a crucial driver for social advancement and growth, offering insights into societal dynamics and contributing to the resolution of future challenges through the systematic documentation of past experiences (Dumitrescu et al., 2015; Richards & Schmidt, 2002). Third, FW pedagogically provides students with a foundational platform to refine their lexical and phrasal selection, organize ideas coherently, enhance drafting and sentence construction, and improve overall editing and stylistic coordination. Last, FW profoundly influences an individual's social life, interaction, and integration within the community, thereby fostering psychological and social adaptation and harmony. Aesthetically, it expands students' creative and expressive horizons, allowing them to record ideas in a style that precisely achieves the intended functional objective (Abdallah, 2014).

Intelligence constitutes a widely discussed concept within educational, psychological, and social scientific discourse. It is acknowledged as a pivotal factor shaping individual trajectories and impacting a multitude of dimensions, including academic performance, psychological states, and social interactions. From a genetic standpoint, intelligence is considered an inherent predisposition transmitted hereditarily. Nevertheless, this does not reveal the substantial contribution of environmental variables. Thus, intelligence is best conceptualized as an emergent property resulting from the dynamic interaction of genetic endowment and environmental conditioning, enabling individuals to actualize their inherited potential through adaptive responses to their milieu. According to Gardner (2004), intelligence is the ability to solve problems or to create products that are valued within one or more cultural settings. It is the capacity for effective adaptation to novel situations and the ability to derive insights from prior experiences.

Specifically, LI stands as one of the most critical and pervasive forms of intelligence. Gardner believes that linguistic intelligence gives students linguistic ability that helps them achieve fluency in expressing themselves in different ways and defining terms, that is, mastering the language (Gardner, 2004). In that sense, it encompasses the four fundamental language skills—speaking, listening, reading, and writing—which are indispensable for human interaction. Alongside these, it integrates other crucial linguistic dimensions such as grammar, orthography, and aesthetic appreciation. The cultivation of LI is therefore paramount for students, as it demonstrably enhances listening, reading, and writing proficiencies, contributes to the development of expressive capabilities, elevates the standard of language use across various contexts, and improves interpersonal linguistic communication. Moreover, it facilitates the accumulation of a robust linguistic repertoire, strengthening individuals' capacity for constructive dialogue, persuasive argumentation, and effective message delivery. Consequently, LI is fundamental for successful social interaction and integration (Armstrong, 2009).

LI holds considerable significance as it empowers students with enhanced learning capabilities. The adeptness in verbal expression and written communication is paramount for fostering interpersonal connections. Students who demonstrate distinction in language use positively reflect this through their linguistic intelligence, exhibiting advanced linguistic faculties such as the strategic deployment of language for persuasion and the capacity to process linguistic structures and scientific discourse for fluency and precise articulation (Al-Zoubi, 2024). Moreover, students cultivate linguistic proficiencies that enable fluent and accurate self-expression. Individuals with well-developed LI manifest these abilities through attentive listening, responsiveness to phonetic and rhythmic patterns, and demonstrated proficiency across listening, reading, writing, and engaging in discussions. Fundamentally, LI encompasses a student's capacity to comprehend, paraphrase, interpret, and retain information from both spoken and written modalities. This construct is also understood to include the ability to communicate effectively and persuasively with others (Hasanudin & Fitriarningsih, 2020).

Existing literature strongly indicates an inherent interrelationship between functional expression and LI; a deficit in LI often correlates with diminished functional written expression. This assertion is supported by empirical studies (Abdallah, 2014; Shafiee, 2020; Widiastuti et al., 2024), which have identified a significant correlational relationship between students' linguistic skills and their LI. Specifically, higher levels of LI among learners are associated with a reduction in writing errors, and vice versa. This theoretical underpinning clarifies that the effective production of functional texts necessitates LI, empowering writers to meticulously select and efficiently employ vocabulary and to contextualize linguistic elements appropriately within sentences (Crane, 2016).

Literature Review

Functional Writing (FW)

In an era characterized by an exponential increase in information, educators are tasked with identifying effective pedagogical strategies that both structure learning content efficiently and ground experiences in authentic, real-world contexts. This approach is crucial for fostering genuine learning. Furthermore, the interconnected forces of economic globalization, the internationalization of contemporary competition-driven societies, and the rapid pace of technological advancements collectively necessitate the development of robust functional competencies (Singer, 2006).

Functional writing is characterized as a genre of writing intrinsically linked to specific social contexts, primarily serving to facilitate communication among individuals for the fulfillment of needs and the organization of affairs. This form of writing deliberately eschews verbal embellishment, imaginative constructs, or aesthetic sophistication. It is distinguished by its directness, avoiding excessive exposition or redundant reiteration of information, and instead aims to achieve its objective and desired purpose through the most concise means (Norris, 1997; Harahsh & Sayed, 2023; Salem, 2013). Operationally defined, functional writing is a structured form of communication governed by specific rules, largely devoid of overt emotional expression, enabling individuals to address practical needs across various daily life occasions.

Examples include letters, invitations, telegrams, reports, summaries, advertisements, and memos.

The contemporary relevance of functional writing has escalated significantly, given that the majority of modern communication transpires through written messages, emails, and online platforms. Consequently, individuals demonstrating strong functional writing skills possess a distinct competitive advantage in the professional sphere and are better equipped to communicate effectively in both personal and professional contexts. Furthermore, functional writing aids individuals in organizing their thoughts and articulating them with clarity and persuasiveness, thereby underscoring the imperative for continuous development and refinement of these skills (Gracey, 2004; Hartnett, 1997; Korbel, 2001).

Within the context of public education, a variety of direct methods and techniques can be effectively employed for teaching functional writing. According to Abdullah (2014), these include leveraging scholarly events for community news dissemination, composing and publishing scripts on online forums and websites, collaborative writing, peer editing, and creating short physical or e-books containing engaging stories for a broader readership. Additionally, utilizing community or school notice boards for message posting and engaging in letter and email writing, particularly through internet platforms and social media, offer practical avenues. This communicative approach enables learners to initiate written communication with peers, extending beyond the classroom to national and global scales. Abdullah's (2014) results suggested incorporating functional writing into regular assignments, recommending that learners: (1) submit homework in report formats rather than traditional ones; (2) regularly compose formal email messages to their teachers detailing academic progress; (3) functionally document course notes alongside general everyday life affairs; and (4), under teacher guidance, produce specific reflective accounts of events to convey targeted messages.

The identification and systematic study of FW domains constitute a critical prerequisite for the effective development of these skills. It is insufficient for educators, parents, experts, or students themselves to merely lament deficiencies in FW without precisely defining the specific

situations or contexts that necessitate its instruction. For functional writing curricula to genuinely reflect authentic communicative situations within society, students must receive targeted training in these areas (Mohammad, 2013; Norris, 1997; Onchera & Manyasi, 2013; Salem, 2013).

The Genre theory is widely supported as a highly effective framework for the teaching and learning of functional writing (Paltridge, 1996; Swales, 2009). Specifically, Burns (2001) articulates this through a wheel model of a teaching-learning cycle, which comprises three interconnected phases: modeling, joint negotiation or construction, and independent construction. First, the modeling phase initiates the cycle by introducing the target functional writing genre to students. At this stage, the teacher elucidates the educational and social functions of the specific genre while simultaneously analyzing its structural components and linguistic features. For instance, when teaching an application letter, the instructor would explain its purpose, like expressing interest in a job vacancy or scholarship, outline the relevant marking criteria, and detail its format, like sender's address, date, recipient's address, salutation, reference, body, and closing tag. This is often demonstrated using a sample formal letter. This comprehensive modeling, applicable to various functional writing documents like internal memos, directly addresses the study's objective of investigating the support and exposure teachers provide to learners in their functional writing tasks.

Following this, the joint negotiation/construction phase engages learners in exercises that involve manipulating relevant language forms. This is a collaborative process where students and their teacher actively discuss the functional writing item, fostering reading, research, and information dissemination; activities crucial to functional writing proficiency. In the context of the present study, this phase would involve the joint construction of internal memos and application letters. Such discussions are invaluable for learners seeking clarification, and they enable teachers to identify and address student weaknesses effectively. This phase also contributes to the study's objective concerning teacher support and exposure in functional writing.

Last, the independent construction phase requires learners to autonomously produce functional writing texts by selecting a topic,

conducting research, and composing the piece. This stage is instrumental in achieving the study's first objective: identifying and describing learners' writing difficulties in functional writing, as these challenges become evident during the actual writing process. Furthermore, this phase addresses the third objective, which seeks to establish how teacher support and exposure influence the assessment of functional writing for effective communication.

Linguistic Intelligence (LI)

Linguistic Intelligence (LI) is broadly defined as an individual's capacity to comprehend, acquire, and effectively utilize language, encompassing both spoken and written modalities. Yogatama et al. (2019) define general linguistic intelligence as the ability to reuse previously acquired knowledge about a language's lexicon, syntax, semantics, and pragmatic conventions to adapt to new tasks quickly. This includes the ability to listen attentively and discern auditory linguistic elements (e.g., phonemes, words), rapidly grasp the meanings of both read and heard words, articulate thoughts proficiently in speech and writing, engage in verbal reasoning, and efficiently recall and present information.

In research contexts, LI is typically quantified by a student's score on a specifically designed LI scale (Gardner, 2004). It is also recognized as the adeptness in employing words to translate complex ideas and convey intricate meanings. This form of intelligence integrates various linguistic faculties, ranging from basic comprehension of signs to advanced reading of narratives and novels, and from composing concise messages to drafting comprehensive reports (Del Moral Pérez et al., 2018; Kurniaman et al., 2020; Maharmeh, 2012; Silwana et al., 2020; Suartama et al., 2024). For this research, LI is operationally defined as a student's ability to understand, apply, and manipulate language competently across diverse real-life scenarios, encompassing written expression, vocabulary, word choice, sentence and structural formation, and the semantic implications of these elements in communicating one's internal thoughts to others.

According to Armstrong (2009) and Teele (2000), LI is widely regarded as the most crucial of the multiple intelligences for language acquisition. It is defined as an individual's adeptness at utilizing words

effectively across both spoken and written modalities. This intelligence facilitates the manipulation of syntactic, phonological, and pragmatic elements, enabling the practical application of language. Armstrong (2009) highlights several key applications of this capacity, including rhetoric (the use of language for persuasion), mnemonics (the use of language for information retention), and explanation (the use of language to enlighten others).

Components and Indicators of Linguistic Intelligence

Individuals demonstrating highly developed LI typically exhibit a range of distinct characteristics. According to Laughlin (1999), such individuals often learn through diverse linguistic activities, including attentive listening, extensive reading, consistent writing, and engaging in verbal interactions. They also exhibit acute sensitivity to the nuances of spoken language, paying close attention and reacting to tone, rhythm, vocal color, and variations in speech. Additionally, they possess a strong capacity for attentively processing, comprehending, and retaining information presented through language, and demonstrate proficiency in clear reading and communication, along with the ability to understand, evaluate, summarize, and interpret written material. Those people have adaptive ability to communicate, argue, explain, and persuade others through effective use of listening, speaking, writing, and reading (p. 5-8).

Gardner (2011) delineates three fundamental aspects of LI, conceptualized as the ability to effectively utilize language in both spoken and written forms. These core components include sensitivity to meaning that encompasses an individual's understanding and application of semantics and pragmatics, auditory sensitivity that refers to a keen awareness and responsiveness to the phonology of language, including sounds, rhythms, and intonation patterns, and mastery of syntax that involves proficiency in the rules governing the structural arrangement of words in sentences, alongside a strong grasp of morphology.

Further characteristics of linguistically intelligent individuals are enumerated by Gardner (2011). These include a notable enjoyment of reading, writing, speaking, and listening, often manifested through frequent repetition of read material. They are typically proficient with spelling patterns and adept at applying grammatical principles. Such

individuals often enjoy engaging in word games like crossword puzzles and poetry, and tend to maintain personal book libraries. They possess an exceptional memory for broad information, effortlessly recalling renowned quotations and proverbs. Furthermore, they are often described as organized and methodical, demonstrating excellent reasoning abilities. They can articulate their viewpoints with clarity, elegance, and nuance, and are capable of elucidating abstract content. These individuals are typically good speakers who enjoy intellectual dispute and the employment of complex language. They exhibit a solid understanding of language usage, including its persuasive and informational functions, and are skilled at understanding others. Finally, a key indicator is their ease and delight in learning other languages, coupled with flexibility in extracting meaning when communicating in multiple languages.

Linguistic ability has consistently been regarded as an indispensable prerequisite for intelligence. This foundational role is evident in the design and components of major intelligence assessments. All prominent intelligence tests incorporate the evaluation of linguistic skills. Binet's language-focused items (Becker, 2003) specifically assess reasoning, knowledge, and working memory. Similarly, Wechsler's verbal ability (Axelrod, 2001) measures encompass a range of subtests, including vocabulary, similarities, arithmetic, digit span, information, and comprehension. Furthermore, Raven's (2000) Mill Hill Vocabulary Scale developed a dedicated test for verbal ability, which complements his well-known analogical reasoning battery. In addition, the Woodcock-Johnson's verbal test (Schrack, 2010) comprehensively evaluates comprehension knowledge, short-term memory, and long-term retrieval. This consistent inclusion across diverse and widely respected intelligence assessments underscores the enduring recognition of linguistic proficiency as a core component of cognitive ability.

Ahmed (2019) identified several key indicators of high linguistic intelligence. Individuals demonstrating this intelligence exhibit a strong capacity for clear and effective communication, both orally and in writing, utilizing precise language. They possess a propensity for thinking in words, coupled with a keen interest in acquiring and rapidly integrating new lexical items, leading to an advanced and extensive

vocabulary. Such individuals actively participate in discussions, debates, and public speaking, showcasing their ability to articulate ideas with accuracy and comprehensive detail. Their linguistic prowess extends to a deep understanding and systematic organization of meanings, including the capacity to grasp abstract concepts and contextual nuances. Furthermore, they demonstrate ease in language production and the ability to differentiate and organize words effectively. Mastery across all four language skills is evident, complemented by strong abilities in communication, discussion, clarification, and persuasion. Finally, a notable characteristic is their capability to generate novel linguistic models for original written compositions or oral communications (p. 99-100).

Importance of Linguistic Intelligence for English Majors

Linguistic intelligence holds profound significance across all age groups and educational stages. For educators, it serves as an invaluable tool for comprehending, internalizing, and effectively conveying information to learners. It facilitates the design and implementation of diverse instructional strategies and activities, such as debates, discussions, interpretations, reporting, speaking, and writing, all of which are instrumental in achieving desired learning outcomes and maximizing student competence within any educational program (Armstrong, 2009; Gardner, 2011). Moreover, LI activities are crucial in preparing learners for future professions as authors, journalists, orators, and editors, by equipping them with the capacity for effective language use in varied contexts and the ability to identify linguistic errors (Teele, 2000).

Beyond professional preparation, LI plays a vital role in fostering students' social interaction, self-expression, and appropriate communication of ideas, thereby enhancing their overall performance and vocabulary recall. It also contributes significantly to improved reading comprehension, increased academic achievement, the development of critical thinking skills, heightened motivation for learning, and the cultivation of both verbal and non-verbal communication abilities (Aminatun et al., 2019; Hifni, 2022; Sternberg, 2003; Widiastuti et al., 2024).

Linguistic intelligence can be developed to a high level of proficiency, as supported by Armstrong (2009). Several factors critically influence the growth and development of LI, encompassing biological aspects, an individual's personal life history, and their cultural and historical background. These factors are elaborated as biological aspects that include genetic or hereditary predispositions, as well as any neurological injuries that may occur pre-natally, peri-natally, or post-natally. It also includes an individual's personal life history encompassing interactions with parents, teachers, peers, and friends, all of whom play a crucial role in fostering intelligence. In essence, both the societal context and the environmental stimuli profoundly shape the development of intellectual capacities. Therefore, children must engage with adults who actively support their skill development and encourage their pursuit of education and training (p. 27-29).

Context of the problem

The study problem stems from a weakness in FW skills among English majors in Saudi Arabia, which was evident in their writings and confirmed by some instructors teaching writing courses to undergraduate students in the English Department (Almuhaysh, 2024; Alshalan, 2019; A Alshehri, 2024; Deraney, 2015). This problem has been further reinforced by local and international studies on FW skills and LI at various stages. Given the importance of FW skills and LI for English majors, empowering students with these skills is essential to meet the demands of higher education, such as research, summaries, and other functional purposes. Additionally, there are complaints from instructors due to the high percentage of spelling, grammatical, and morphological errors in students' answers, as well as illegible handwriting and a lack of organization.

Despite the rich theoretical foundation for both FW and LI, a notable gap exists in the systematic investigation and practical application of these concepts within the context of EFL majors. While the literature provides a conceptual understanding of these constructs, there is a distinct lack of empirical inquiry and structured methodologies that define and identify the appropriate skills for English majors at specific proficiency levels. Furthermore, the correlational relationship between linguistic intelligence and functional writing has been theoretically

posited but remains under-examined through direct, empirical evidence. This study, therefore, is designed to address this critical research gap. It seeks to enrich the existing literary framework by providing a methodical and evidence-based identification of appropriate functional writing and linguistic intelligence skills specifically tailored for Level 2 English majors. By doing so, this research offers a practical guide for curriculum design and pedagogical practice. Moreover, the study aims to provide empirical evidence of the nature of the relationship between these two critical language domains, offering a robust foundation for future research and a clear demonstration of how LI contributes to the mastery of functional writing.

Statement of the problem

The current study was motivated by the researcher's observation of the scarcity of such studies in the study community. While the mastery of FW skills is universally acknowledged as indispensable for English majors, enabling them to navigate diverse academic, professional, and civic communication demands, the role and development of LI skills in this context often receive less explicit attention. Linguistic intelligence encompasses the capacity for language, including its structure, meaning, and application, suggesting a foundational link to writing proficiency. Despite the intuitive connection and individual importance of these constructs to effective communication and academic success, empirical research that systematically examines their correlation and mutual influence among undergraduate English majors is notably limited. This dearth of integrated studies represents a critical void, hindering a comprehensive understanding of how students' inherent linguistic aptitude might translate into practical writing abilities, and conversely, how targeted writing instruction might enhance broader linguistic intelligence. Therefore, this study seeks to bridge this research gap by providing empirical evidence on the relationship between FW and LI skills, offering valuable insights for curriculum development and pedagogical strategies tailored to this specific student population. Accordingly, the primary research problem addressed in this study is: What are the FW skills and their relationship with LI among English majors? This overarching question is further delineated into the following specific sub-questions:

1. What are the appropriate FW and LI skills among English majors?
2. What is the current level of FW and LI skills among English majors?
3. What is the statistically significant correlational relationship between FW and LI skills among English majors?

Method and Procedures

Design

The study adopted a descriptive-correlational research design, deemed appropriate for collecting the data required for this study. To answer the study questions, this study adopted a mixed-methods research design, aligning with its recognition as a "third methodological movement" that transcends the traditional dominance of positivism and interpretivism. This approach posits that the research problem itself dictates the selection of appropriate quantitative and qualitative methods (Creswell, 2003). Consequently, the research framework for both data collection and analysis integrated quantitative components, tests for FW and LI, and a qualitative component, thematic-qualitative analysis of existing data to construct robust FW and LI skill lists.

Participants

The study recruited 60 female undergraduate students at Majmmah University enrolled in level 1 and studying a course called ' Writing 1' throughout an academic semester. Previous research has yielded somewhat conflicting findings regarding the existence of gender differences in linguistic intelligence and functional writing skills. Consequently, to mitigate the potential influence of gender as a variable on the study's outcomes, the current research was deliberately confined to a cohort of level two female students within the English Language Department. After consenting to participate in the treatment, the FW and LI skills tests were administered to the participants.

Data Collection

List of Appropriate FW and LI Skills for English majors

The development and validation of the FW and LI skills list, specifically tailored for Level Two English majors, involved a systematic, mixed-methods approach. The procedures undertaken to design, refine, and finalize the lists are detailed as follows.

Step 1: Initial list generation and refinement

The process began by addressing the first research question, which aimed to identify appropriate FW and LI skills. A comprehensive thematic-qualitative analysis was conducted on relevant literature for FW (e.g., Abdullah, 2014; Dumitrescu et al., 2015; Richards & Schmidt, 2002) and LI (e.g., Ahmed, 2019; del Moral Pérez et al., 2018; Kurniaman et al., 2020; Handayani et al., 2021; Maharmah, 2012; Skourdi et al., 2012; Teele, 2000). This iterative process led to the emergence of categorized functional writing skills. Preliminary minor themes were merged, and some minor points were expanded into broader themes. The draft list was then submitted to a panel of 40 experts in applied linguistics in the Saudi English departments. Their expertise was leveraged to evaluate the list for consistency and practical convenience, and to solicit any necessary amendments.

Step 2: Quantitative validation and data collection

A quantitative validation process was implemented. A 5-point Likert scale was designed to assess the importance of each item on the lists, ranging from 1 (Not important at all) to 5 (Extremely important). After that, two online surveys were developed using Google Forms, incorporating the finalized FW and LI skill lists. The reliability of the survey as a study instrument was rigorously assessed using the split-half method, with Cronbach's Alpha yielding a coefficient of 0.89 and 0.91 for FW and LI, respectively, indicating high internal consistency. Clear instructions and a direct link to the surveys were provided. The primary task was to rate the perceived importance of each FW and LI skill for the level two English majors. Based on the valuable feedback and suggested amendments from the expert panel, refined lists were meticulously compiled as indicated in Tables 1 and 2.

Step 3: Final list development

The final phase involved preparing the collected data for analysis and refining the FW and LI skill lists. SPSS descriptive statistics were utilized. Means were calculated for all items based on participant responses. Subsequently, all items were clustered into their corresponding themes, forming a broader taxonomy of 6 themes and 28 skills for FW and 4 main categories and 15 skills for LI.

Skills and items of FW and LI Tests

Following the finalization of the comprehensive lists for FW and LI skills, a specific set of these skills was identified for inclusion in the two main assessment instruments: FW and LI skill tests. It was recognized that attempting to measure all skills from the proposed lists was not feasible due to significant practical constraints, particularly the extensive time commitment required and the need for diverse assessment formats, including oral components for linguistic intelligence and various written tasks for functional writing. As is common practice in the field of educational and psychological assessment, a representative sample of items can be used to effectively measure the broader construct (Bachman & Adrian, 2022). This approach allows for a valid and reliable evaluation while managing logistical limitations. Consequently, the final skills included in the two tests were strategically selected to represent the two constructs, as detailed in the results Tables 4 and 5. This methodology aligns with established principles of test design, ensuring that the chosen items provide a robust and accurate measure of the target competencies without the burden of an exhaustive, impractical assessment (McKay & Brown, 2015).

FW Skills' Test for English majors.

Description of FW Test Components

The FW test includes a three-part assessment designed for Level 2 English majors. It is comprised of tasks that target high-importance functional writing skills identified in this study. The test components are:

1. Task 1: Formal & Academic Communication: This section assesses the ability to draft professional emails for academic purposes, such as requesting a letter of recommendation from an instructor while adhering to formal conventions.
2. Task 2: Summarization & Critical Review: This task requires students to read an academic text and demonstrate their ability to both concisely summarize its main points and provide a critical review analyzing its arguments and contributions.
3. Task 3: Practical Reporting & Informative Writing: This component evaluates students' skills in practical, real-world writing by requiring them to create an official announcement for a class program and a formal problem report to department staff.

Test Validation

Test validity was established through two primary methods: face validity and internal consistency. Upon completion of these rigorous construction and validation phases, the test was finalized for administration to the main study participants (Appendix 1).

- Face validity was ensured by presenting the test to a panel of experts in Applied Linguistics, curricula, and teaching methodologies. Their expert opinions confirmed the test's suitability for the study group, the scientific and linguistic soundness of its items, and the clarity of its instructions. Subsequent revisions incorporated their feedback, rendering the test suitable for piloting.
- Internal consistency validity was assessed using Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficients, calculated between each skill's score and the total test score (100 points). The coefficients, ranging from 0.714 to 0.578 ($p < 0.05$), indicate strong internal consistency.

Test Piloting. Piloting the test of the FW skills was conducted with 30 English majors to determine the optimal completion time and to further validate its psychometric properties.

Item Analysis and Test Duration. Item analysis, performed after piloting the test, revealed acceptable ease and difficulty coefficients (0.21 to 0.59) and discrimination coefficients (0.3 to 0.5) for all questions. The appropriate test completion time was determined to be 120 minutes, adding 5 minutes for test instructions.

Test Reliability. Test reliability was established using the test-retest method, with a two-week interval between administrations. A high correlation coefficient of 0.803 between the two administrations confirmed the test's stability.

Linguistic Intelligence (LI) Skills Test*Description of LI Test Components*

The linguistic intelligence test includes a three-part assessment designed for Level 2 English majors. It is comprised of tasks that target high-importance linguistic intelligence skills identified in this study. The test components are:

1. Task 1: Advanced Lexical and Semantic Mastery: This section assesses students' ability to understand and utilize nuanced vocabulary, including idiomatic expressions and figurative language. Students will be required to analyze the connotative meanings of words in context and demonstrate their understanding through sentence construction.
2. Task 2: Sophisticated Written Communication and Rhetorical Analysis: This task requires students to read a short academic passage and then respond with a persuasive or argumentative essay. The response should demonstrate their ability to apply advanced syntax, rhetorical devices, and stylistic flexibility to a specific audience and purpose.
3. Task 3: Critical Reading and Textual Analysis: This component evaluates students' skills in deconstructing and interpreting a provided text. Students will be required to identify the author's voice, perspective, and underlying assumptions, as well as answer inferential questions about the text's subtext and implications.

Test Validation

Test validity was established through two primary methods: face validity and internal consistency. Upon completion of these rigorous construction and validation phases, the test was finalized for administration to the main study participants (Appendix 2).

- Face validity was ensured by presenting the test to a panel of experts in Linguistics, curricula, and teaching methodologies. Their expert opinions confirmed the test's suitability for the study group, the scientific and linguistic soundness of its items, and the clarity of its instructions. Subsequent revisions incorporated their feedback, rendering the test suitable for piloting.
- Internal consistency validity was assessed using Cronbach's Alpha reliability coefficients, calculated between each skill's score and the total test score (100 points). The coefficients, ranging from 0.71 to 0.74 ($p < 0.05$), indicate strong internal consistency.

Piloting the test. Piloting the LI skills test was conducted with 30 English majors to determine the optimal completion time and to further validate its psychometric properties.

Test reliability. It was established using the test-retest method, with a two-week interval between administrations. A high correlation coefficient of 0.91 between the two administrations confirmed the test's stability.

Item Analysis and Test Duration. Item analysis, performed after the pilot, revealed acceptable ease and difficulty coefficients (0.33 to 0.79) and discrimination coefficients (0.28 to 0.53) for all questions. The appropriate test completion time was determined to be 120 minutes, adding 5 minutes for test instructions.

Inter-Rater Reliability Procedure

To ensure the objectivity and reliability of the scoring, an inter-rater procedure was implemented for both the FW and LI skill tests. The assessment was conducted independently by two evaluators: the researcher and a colleague from the English department, using the scoring guide attached to the tests (Appendices 1 & 2). Each evaluator independently graded every student's performance on both tests using the established scoring guide. This blind assessment was crucial to prevent any bias from influencing the scores. After the independent scoring was completed, the scores from the two evaluators for each student were collected. A final score for every student on each test was determined by calculating the average of the two independent scores. This procedure of averaging the scores served to mitigate any potential individual rater bias and ensured that the final scores were a more reliable and objective representation of each student's performance.

Data Analysis

The collected data were subjected to a rigorous statistical analysis using methods appropriate for the research design. Specifically, descriptive statistics, including means and standard deviations, were computed to summarize and characterize the data distributions for both FW skills and LI. Furthermore, the Pearson reliability coefficient was calculated to assess the internal consistency and reliability of the developed assessment instruments.

Results and Discussion

Results of the first question

To answer the first question, What are the appropriate FW and LI skills among English majors?, a thematic analysis of related literature resulted

in preliminary lists of FW and LI skills appropriate for level two English majors. Based on the valuable feedback and suggested amendments from the expert panel, refined lists were meticulously compiled as indicated in Tables 1 and 2.

Table 1. Final List of Appropriate FW skills among English majors

No.	Themes	Skills	Mean	Std.
1.	Formal and Professional Correspondence	1 Compose formal letters	4.05	1.5
		2 write professional emails	4.3	1.19
		3 Construct Memos	3.99	1.4
		4 Write a biography	4.5	1.4
		5 Writing a short biography or profile about a famous person	4.02	1.19
		6 Inquire for clarifications and guidance	4.5	1.56
2.	Informational and Reporting Texts	7 Write concise reports	4.56	1.27
		8 Summarize academic texts	4.78	1.23
		9 Write an outline	4.6	1.56
		10 Prepare news items and announcements	3.89	1.57
		11 Review books and articles	4.08	1.44
		12 Formulate a formal complaint regarding an individual or entity	4.05	1.3
3.	Digital, Public, and Social Communication	13 Compose online posts	4	1.7
		14 Create simple advertisements	4	1.9
		15 Compose messages for personal interaction (e.g., appraisals, accepting or declining invitations, satisfaction and dissatisfaction, thanking, and apologies)	4.89	1.5
4.	Academic and Reflective Documentation	16 Take functional notes	4	1.7
		17 write academic reflections and interpretations	3.88	1.7
		18 Review an artistic work critically	3.2	1.5
		19 Write personal reflections about things and people	3.1	1.8
		20 Providing constructive written feedback	4.2	1.3
5.	Concise Communication	21 Compose telegrams/short messages	3.99	1.6
		22 Write short notices	4.5	1.5
		23 Developing concise instructional manuals and guidelines	4.4	1.45

		24	Accurately completing application forms.	4.6	1.34
6.	Writing for Organizational and Planning Purposes	25	Construct to-do lists for task management	4	1.5
		26	Develop systematic reminders to ensure the timely completion of tasks	4	1.6
		27	Compile comprehensive shopping lists for household or personal needs.	3.57	1.7
		28	Formulate a structured schedule for time-bound activities	3.7	1.5

Table 2. Final List of Appropriate LI skills among English majors

No	Main categories	Skills	Mean	Std.
1.	Lexical and Semantic Mastery	1. Use a wide range of sophisticated vocabulary, including academic and technical terms.	4.01	1.54
		2. Understand and appropriately use idiomatic expressions, metaphors, similes, and other figures of speech in both written and spoken contexts.	4.31	1.99
		3. Understand word origins and structure (roots, prefixes, suffixes).	3.93	1.14
		4. Understand precise connotations and subtle differences in meaning of sophisticated vocabulary.	4.5	1.46
		5. Infer the meaning of unfamiliar words.	4.02	1.39
2.	Written Communication	6. Adapt writing style, tone, and register for various audiences and purposes.	4.56	1.27
		7. Craft well-structured academic essays that present complex arguments.	4.78	1.23
		8. Synthesize information from multiple sources, and maintain a clear, logical flow.	4.6	1.56
		9. Identify and correct grammatical, syntactical, or lexical errors in both their writing and the writing of others.	3.89	1.57
		10. Identify and consciously employ rhetorical strategies (e.g., parallelism,	4.18	1.54

		anaphora, antithesis) to enhance the persuasiveness and impact of written communication.		
		11. Construct varied and complex sentences and effectively convey intricate relationships between ideas.	4.05	1.33
3. Oral Communication and Public Speaking	12.	Articulate orally complex arguments and debates.	4	1.7
	13.	Participate constructively in academic discussions.	4.7	1.08
	14.	Deliver a well-organized and engaging public presentation on a different topic.	4.3	1.91
	15.	Comprehend spoken information.	4.89	1.6
	16.	Manage a conversation or discussion and guide it towards a specific goal.	3.99	1.7
	17.	Are aware of language changes based on social context, audience, and formality.	3.98	1.03
4. Reading and Textual Analysis	18.	Infer meaning, and understand the subtext, implications, and hidden assumptions within a text.	4.2	1.7
	19.	Identify an author's voice, perspective, and underlying motivations.	3.58	1.4
	20.	Identify its key components (e.g., thesis, evidence, counterarguments)	4.2	1.4

The results, as presented in the attached Tables 1 and 2, provide a clear answer to the first question by outlining comprehensive lists of skills in both domains and quantifying their perceived importance based on an expert panel's feedback.

Table 1 presents the final list of 28 FW skills categorized into six themes. A close examination of the mean scores indicates that all skills were rated as important (with means above 3.0 on a 5-point scale). However, certain skills were deemed exceptionally important. Notably, "Compose messages for personal interaction" (Mean = 4.89), "Summarize academic texts" (Mean = 4.78), and "Write concise reports" (Mean = 4.56) received the highest ratings. This suggests that the expert panel places a high value on students' ability to engage in both professional and social communication, as well as their capacity for

summarizing and reporting information. These findings support the theoretical premise that FW for this level should encompass a blend of professional, academic, and interpersonal communication skills, reflecting the diverse contexts in which English majors will need to write.

Table 2 presents the final list of 20 LI skills, organized into four main categories. Similar to the FW skills, all LI skills were rated as important, with mean scores ranging from 3.58 to 4.89. The most highly rated skills were "Comprehend spoken information" (Mean = 4.89), "Craft well-structured academic essays that present complex arguments" (Mean = 4.78), and "Participate constructively in academic discussions" (Mean = 4.70). These results highlight the expert panel's emphasis on both reception and production skills. The high mean scores for these items indicate that for Level 2 English majors, linguistic intelligence is not merely about vocabulary and grammar but also the practical application of these skills in complex academic tasks such as formal argumentation, academic discussion, and information comprehension. This validates the study's approach of moving beyond traditional linguistic components to include more dynamic and interactive skills.

In conclusion, the data from both tables directly answer the study question. The lists of skills, validated by expert ratings, provide a definitive taxonomy of appropriate FW and LI competencies for Level 2 English majors. The high mean scores across all items demonstrate that these skills are collectively considered essential, with a particular emphasis on the practical application of language in academic, professional, and social contexts.

Results of the second question

To answer the second question, what is the current level of FW and LI skills among English majors? The FW and LI skill tests were administered to the participants, and skill proficiency benchmarks were determined as indicated in Table 3. The results are illustrated in Tables 4 and 5.

Table 3. Skill proficiency benchmarks

Level	Benchmark (as a percentage of total score)
Excellent	Performance is outstanding, with scores of 80% or higher of the total points for that task.
High	Performance is strong, with scores between 60% and 79% of the total points for that task.
Moderate	Performance is at an acceptable level, with scores between 40% and 59% of the total points for that task.
Low	Performance is below expectations, with scores below 40% of the total points for that task.

Table 4. Results of FW Skill Test

Tasks	Skills measured	Total score	Mean	Std. Dev	Percentage	Level
Task 1: Formal & Academic Communication	Compose formal letters/write professional emails	30	18.04	1.65	60.1%	High
Task 2: Summarization & Critical Review	Summarize academic texts	15	11.2	1.59	74.7%	High
	Review books and articles	25	9.05	1.68	36.2%	Low
Task 3: Practical Reporting & Informative Writing	Write concise reports	15	8.1	1.98	54%	Low
	Prepare news items and announcements	15	10.3	1.50	68.7%	Moderate
Total		100	56.69	1.68	56.69%	Moderate

Table 4 indicates that the average mean for the entire test is 56.69 out of 100, placing the overall proficiency level in the Moderate range (40%-59%). The average standard deviation is 1.68, indicating a consistent spread of scores among the skills. Students demonstrated a high level of proficiency in three skills: "Compose formal letters/write professional emails" (60.1%), "Summarize academic texts" (74.7%), and "Prepare news items and announcements" (68.7%). The skill "Write concise reports" (54%) falls within the moderate proficiency level. Students showed a low level of proficiency in "Review books and articles" (36.2%).

Table 5. Results of the LI Skill Test

Tasks	Skills Measured	Total Score	Mean	Std. Dev	Percentage	Level
Task 1: Understand/use		20	10.8	1.98	54.45%	Moderate

Advanced Lexical and Semantic Mastery	idiomatic expressions, figurative language, and nuanced vocabulary	9					e
Task 2: Sophisticated Written Communication	Adapt writing style, tone, and register for various audiences and purposes	15	8.00	2.10	53.33%		Moderate
	Identify and consciously employ rhetorical strategies	15	8.56	2.58	57.07%		Moderate
	Construct varied and complex sentences	10	7.60	1.48	76.00%		High
Task 3: Critical Reading & Textual Analysis	Identify and explain underlying assumption	10	5.50	1.50	55.00%		Moderate
	Identify the author's voice, perspective, and motivations	10	4.10	1.98	41.00%		Moderate
	Identify key components (thesis, evidence, counterarguments)	10	6.09	2.10	60.90%		High
	Infer meaning, and understand subtext/implications	10	5.30	1.48	53.00%		Moderate
Total		100	56.04	1.90	56.04%		Moderate

Table 5 specifies the level of each skill based on the mean scores and the four-level benchmark scale in Table 3. The average mean for the entire test is 56.04 out of 100, which corresponds to an overall proficiency level of Moderate. The average standard deviation is 1.90, suggesting a relatively consistent performance across the different skills. Students demonstrated a high level of proficiency in two skills:

"Construct varied and complex sentences" and "Identify key components (thesis, evidence, counterarguments)." Students showed a moderate level of proficiency in the remaining six skills, including "Understand/use idiomatic expressions...", all skills in Sophisticated Written Communication except for one, and all skills in Critical Reading & Textual Analysis except for one.

Results of the third question

Using Pearson's correlation coefficient (r), which measures the linear relationship between two variables, statistically significant positive correlation ($r = 0.651$, $p = 0.001$, <0.05) exists between FW skills and Linguistic Intelligence LI among the English majors. This means that as students' scores on the FW test increase, their scores on the LI test tend to increase as well. This suggests that the observed correlation is highly unlikely to have occurred by random chance and is a reliable finding for this group of students. Thus, the data show that English majors with stronger Functional Writing skills also tend to have stronger Linguistic Intelligence skills, and vice versa (Table 6).

Table 6. Correlation between FW and LI

Constructs	<i>M</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>N</i>	<i>r</i>	<i>p</i> *
FW	56.69	1.68	60	0.651	0.001
LI	56.04	1.90			

* $p < .05$

The result of the statistically significant positive correlation between FW and LI skills is robust. A correlation coefficient of $r=0.651$ is generally considered to represent a strong relationship. This confirms that the two skill sets are not independent but are meaningfully related. The strength of this relationship suggests that students who perform well in one area are highly likely to perform well in the other. Additionally, this result is both logical and theoretically sound. FW, by its nature, is a practical application of core linguistic abilities. It requires not only correct grammar and vocabulary but also the sophisticated use of tone, style, and rhetorical strategies to suit different audiences and purposes. These are precisely the skills measured by the LI test. Therefore, the strong correlation suggests that LI serves as a foundational skill set upon

which FW abilities are built. This finding is consistent with previous studies that investigated the relationship between these two variables (Aminatun, 2019; Harahsh & Sayed, 2023; Maharmeh, 2012; Mulyaningsih, 2013).

While this is very compelling, it is crucial to state that correlation does not imply causation (Nunes et al., 2023; Willett, 2023; Ksir & Hart, 2016). While the data shows that strong FW skills and strong LI skills exist together in the same students, it does not prove that one skill causes the other. For instance, a third variable, such as a student's general academic aptitude, their reading habits, or their motivation to excel in their studies, could be a common factor influencing both their FW and LI test scores. While it is highly probable that a causal link exists (i.e., higher LI skills lead to better FW skills), a correlational study alone cannot definitively establish the direction of this causal relationship. This is a standard and essential point to include in any academic discussion of correlational findings.

Conclusion

The strong and statistically significant positive correlation observed between FW skills and LI highlights a profound and crucial relationship for undergraduate English majors. This finding extends beyond a mere statistical association, deeply implying that a student's practical proficiency in various forms of functional writing is intrinsically and inextricably linked to their broader, underlying linguistic competence. This suggests that the ability to compose professional correspondence, craft informative reports, engage in digital communication, and produce academic documentation does not develop in isolation but is significantly supported and influenced by an individual's command of language structure, vocabulary, and nuanced expression. Consequently, these results advocate for educators to adopt a more holistic and integrated approach to language education. Instead of traditionally treating FW and LI as distinct and often separately instructed subjects, the curriculum should be thoughtfully redesigned to proactively foster their inherent interdependence.

This integration means that instructional strategies primarily aimed at enhancing LI are now understood to have a direct and powerful positive impact on students' functional writing abilities. They may include

rigorous advanced vocabulary lessons that delve into semantic precision and contextual usage, workshops focused on critical reading to deconstruct complex arguments and rhetorical devices, and dedicated sessions on mastering complex sentence structures and paragraph coherence. For instance, a richer vocabulary enables more precise and impactful professional emails, while the ability to analyze complex texts directly translates into stronger summarization and report-writing skills. The mastery of varied sentence structures allows for more sophisticated and articulate academic and reflective documentation. Building upon these robust findings, it is therefore recommended that future research systematically explore the development and rigorous evaluation of integrated training programs specifically aimed at simultaneously improving both FW skills and LI. Furthermore, it is critical to evaluate student skills against standardized levels to ensure consistent and comparable measures of progress across different cohorts and institutions. Investigating the effect of using electronic educational aids (e.g., AI-powered writing assistants, interactive grammar platforms) is also warranted, as technology may offer innovative pathways to reinforce this integrated learning. Such concerted efforts would not only further validate the critical importance of focusing on both FW and LI as interconnected and indispensable components but also drive the evolution of effective linguistic communication pedagogy among English majors, ultimately better preparing them for diverse communicative demands.

Recommendations and Further Directions

Based on the strong positive correlation identified between FW skills and LI, the following recommendations are put forth to enhance the educational experience and outcomes for undergraduate English majors:

1. Given the close link, it is crucial to move beyond viewing FW and LI as distinct entities. Curricula for English majors should be revised to explicitly integrate activities that simultaneously develop both. This could involve embedding advanced vocabulary acquisition, complex sentence structuring, rhetorical analysis, and critical reading within practical writing assignments.
2. Educators should adopt pedagogical approaches that foster the interdependence of language skills. This means designing lessons

- that not only teach the mechanics of various FW genres but also enhance students' deeper understanding of linguistic patterns, nuances, and effective rhetorical choices. Workshops focusing on advanced grammatical structures, stylistic variations, and the logical organization of arguments can serve this dual purpose.
3. Faculty members teaching English majors should receive professional development focused on strategies for teaching FW through the lens of LI. This training could cover methods for diagnosing specific LI strengths and weaknesses and tailoring instruction to leverage or improve these areas within writing tasks.
 4. Longitudinal research should be conducted to track the development of FW and LI skills in English majors over their entire academic program. This would provide valuable insights into the developmental trajectories of these skills and identify critical periods or interventions that have the most significant long-term impact.
 5. While this study highlights a general correlation, future research could delve deeper into which specific components of linguistic intelligence (e.g., semantic knowledge, syntactic awareness, pragmatic competence) most strongly predict or contribute to proficiency in different types of functional writing.
 6. As noted in the current conclusion, further research should investigate the effectiveness of incorporating various electronic educational aids (e.g., AI-powered writing feedback tools, interactive grammar platforms, digital language learning applications) in enhancing both FW and LI skills among English majors.
 7. It is recommended to complement quantitative findings with qualitative studies (e.g., interviews, focus groups) to understand students' perceptions of the relationship between their linguistic intelligence and writing abilities, as well as their experiences with integrated instructional approaches. This could provide rich contextual data to inform pedagogical practices.

References

- A Alshehri, A. (2024). Investigating Saudi EFL Female University Students' Command of Journalistic Writing: An SFL-based Study on Textual Organization. *Arab World English Journal*, 15(1).

- Abdallah, M. M. S. (2014). Teaching and Learning English Functional Writing: Investigating Egyptian EFL Student Teachers' Currently-Needed Functional Writing Skills. Research Paper Presented at the International Educational Conference: 'Colleges of Education & Restructuring Education', hosted and organised by Assiut University College of Education, Assiut, Egypt (10-11 May).
- Ahmed, N. A. (2019). The Effectiveness of a Training Program Based on Communication Skills in Developing Linguistic Intelligence Among Primary School Students (*Unpublished Master's Thesis*). Faculty of Education, Aswan University.
- Al-Zoubi, S. M. (2024). Linguistic Intelligence of Academically Gifted University Students. *Theory and Practice in Language Studies*, 14(10), 3067-3075.
- Almuhaysh, M. A. A. (2024). *Exploring EFL Writing Strategies in Saudi Arabia: Are We Teaching Students What They Need?*. Ohio University.
- Alshalan, K. F. (2019). A systemic functional linguistic analysis of cohesion and the writing quality of Saudi female EFL undergraduate students. *AWEJ*, 1, 62.
- Aminatun, D., Ngadiso, N., & Marmanto, S. (2019). Applying the PLEASE strategy to teach writing skills to students with different linguistic intelligences. *Teknosastik*, 16(1), 34-40.
- Armstrong, T. (2009). *Multiple intelligences in the classroom (3rd ed.)*. Alexandria, USA: ASCD, p. 27.
- Axelrod, B. N. (2001). Administration duration for the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale III and Wechsler Memory Scale-III. *Archives of Clinical Neuropsychology*, 16, pp. 293-301.
- Bachman, L., & Adrian, P. (2022). *Language assessment in practice: Developing language assessments and justifying their use in the real world*. Oxford University Press.
- Bangert-Drowns, R. L., Hurley, M. M., & Wilkinson, B. (2004). The effects of school-based Writing-to Learn interventions on academic achievement: *A meta-analysis*. *Review of Educational Research*, 74, 29-58

- Becker, K. A. (2003). *History of the Stanford-Binet intelligence scales: Content and psychometrics. (Stanford-Binet Intelligence Scales, Fifth Edition Assessment Service Bulletin No. 1)*. Itasca, IL: Riverside Publishing.
- Crane, C. (2016). Understanding and evaluating L2 personal letter writing: A systemic functional linguistics analysis of student texts in German. *Die Unterrichtspraxis/Teaching German*, 49(2), 122-139.
- Creswell, J. (2003). *Research design: Qualitative, quantitative, and mixed methods approaches* (2nd ed.). Sage, Thousand Oaks.
- Del Moral Pérez, M. E., Guzmán Duque, A. P., & Fernández García, L. C. (2018). Game-based learning: increasing the logical-mathematical, naturalistic, and linguistic learning levels of primary school students. *Journal of New Approaches in Educational Research*, 7(1), 31-39. <https://doi.org/10.7821/naer.2018.1.248>
- del Moral Pérez, M. E., Guzmán Duque, A. P., & Fernández García, L. C. (2018). Game-based learning: Increasing the logical-mathematical, naturalistic, and linguistic learning levels of primary school students. *Journal of New Approaches in Educational Research*, 7(1), 31-39.
- Deraney, P. (2015). Analysis of systemic functional linguistics preparatory year writing in a Saudi university. In *Teaching and learning in Saudi Arabia: Perspectives from higher education* (pp. 49-70). Rotterdam: SensePublishers.
- Dumitrescu, C. I., Coman, M. L., & Nuțu, I. C. (2015). Improving functional texts writing skills in English as a foreign language. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 203, 168-172.
- Eid, Y.(2022). Linguistic Intelligence and Achievement Motivation as Predictors of Academic Excellence Among Saudi Female University Students. *Journal of Special Education, Zagazig University*, 38, 261-310.

- Gardner, H. (2004). Audiences for the Theory of Multiple Intelligences*. Teachers College Record, 106(1), 212-220. <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9620.2004.00329.x>
- Gardner, H. (2011). *Frames of Mind: The Theory of Multiple Intelligences (10th ed.)*. New York: Basic Books.
- Gracey, C. (2004). Mastering the Writing Process. Retrieved from <http://www.back2college.com/writprocess.htm>
- Graham, S. (2006). Writing. In P. Alexander & P. Winne (Eds.), *Handbook of educational psychology* (pp. 457–478). Mahwah, NJ: Erlbaum
- Graham, S., Gillespie, A., & McKeown, D. (2013). Writing: Importance, development, and instruction. *Reading and writing*, 26(1), 1-15.
- Handayani, R., Sakkir, G., & Kasman, R. (2021). The Influence of Verbal-Linguistic Intelligence on Students' Learning Outcomes in English at SMA Negeri 1 Sidrap. *EduLine: Journal of Education and Learning Innovation*, 1(2), 141-148.
- Harahsh, S. T. & Sayed, A.K. (2023). A Proposed Instructional Model Based on the Theory of Successful Intelligence for Developing Literary Criticism and Functional Writing Skills Among First-Year Secondary Students. *The Egyptian Association for Curricula and Methods of Teaching*, 25, 12–62.
- Hartnett, Carolyn G. (1997). A Functional Approach to Composition offers an Alternative. *Composition Chronicle: Newsletter of Writing Teachers*, 10(5), 5-8.
- Hasanudin, C., & Fitriarningsih, A. (2020). Verbal Linguistic Intelligence of the First-Year Students of Indonesian Education Program: A Case in Reading Subject. *European Journal of Educational Research*, 9(1), 117–128. <https://doi.org/10.12973/eujer.9.1.117>
- Hifni, H. (2022). The Relationship of Students 'Self-Efficacy, Linguistic Intelligence, and Speaking Ability (A Correlational Study At The Seventh Grade Bilingual Students of Islamic Junior High School of Madrasah Pembangunan Uin Jakarta). *Master's Thesis*, Jakarta: Fitk Uin Syarif Hidayatullah Jakarta.

- Korbel, T. M. (2001). Strengthening Student Writing Skills. Master of Arts Action Research Project, Saint Xavier University, and Skylight Professional Development Field-Based Master's program. Available at: <http://www.eric.ed.gov.doi.454546>.
- Ksir, C., & Hart, C. L. (2016). Correlation still does not imply causation. *The Lancet Psychiatry*, 3(5), 401.
- Kurniaman, O., Maharani, D. S., Noviana, E., & Afendi, N. (2020). Development of linguistic intelligence instruments for elementary school students. *English Language Studies (ELS)*, 3(1). <https://doi.org/10.34050/els-jish.v3i1.8966>
- Kurniaman, O., Maharani, D. S., Noviana, E., & Afendi, N. (2020). Development of linguistic intelligence instruments for elementary school students. *English Language Studies (ELS)*, 3(1). <https://doi.org/10.34050/els-jish.v3i1.8966>
- Laughlin, J. (1999). Multiple Intelligences. *Inquiry*, 4(2), 4-18.
- Maharmah, S. M. (2012). The effectiveness of an educational program based on the communicative approach in improving students' functional and creative writing skills and linguistic intelligence. (Doctoral dissertation). Amman Arab University.
- Maharmeh, S. M. (2012). The Effectiveness of an Educational Program Based on the Communicative Approach in Improving Students' Functional and Creative Writing Skills and Linguistic Intelligence. (PhD Dissertation). Amman Arab University.
- McKay, S. L., & Brown, J. D. (2015). *Teaching and assessing EIL in local contexts around the world*. Routledge.
- Mohammad, R. (2013). *The effect of keeping portfolios on the writing ability of Advanced EFL Learners, University of applied science & Technology*. Iran: Sarakhs.
- Mulyaningsih, T., Rais, A. D., & Sulistyawati, H. (2013). A correlation study between grammatical competence, verbal linguistic intelligence, and writing ability. *English Education*, 2(1).

- Norris, J. A. (1997). Functional language intervention in the classroom: Avoiding the tutoring trap. *Topics in Language Disorders*, 17(2), 49-68.
- Nunes, G. S., de Moraes, W. S., de Souza Sampaio, V., Seda, N. R., dos Santos Mouta, G., Dangui, A. J. M., ... & Nakagawa, T. H. (2023). Indeed, Correlation Does Not Indicate Causation!. *journal of orthopaedic & sports physical therapy*, 53(11), 723-725
- Onchera, P. O., & Manyasi, B. N. (2013). Functional writing skills for effective communication: the English Language classroom in Kenya. *Journal of Emerging Trends in Educational Research and Policy Studies*, 4(6), 842-847.
- Paltridge, B. (1996) Genre, text types and the language learning classroom. *ELT Journal*, 50(3), 237-243.
- Raven, J. (2000). The Raven's Progressive Matrices: Change and Stability over Culture and Time. *Cognitive Psychology*, 41, pp. 1–48.
- Richards, J. C. & Schmidt, R. (2002). *Longman Dictionary of Language Teaching & Applied Linguistics (3rd ed.)* London: Longman.
- Rodríguez-Escobar, C., & Saldías, C. K. (2025). Critical Thinking in Pre-Service English Teachers: Evaluating and Promoting Analytical Skills through Academic Writing. *Journal of Teacher Training and Educational Research*, 2(3), 99-110.
- Salem, A. A. (2013). The effect of writer's workshop approach to develop functional writing skills of primary stage pre-service English language teachers in Egypt. *International Journal of Applied Linguistics & English Literature (IJALEL)*, 5(2), 70- 80.
- Schrank, F. A. (2010). Woodcock-Johnson III Tests of Cognitive Abilities. In A. Davis (Ed.). *Handbook of Pediatric Neuropsychology*. New York, NY: Springer Publishing Company.
- Schultz, K., & Fecho, B. (2000). Society's child: Social context and writing development. *Educational Psychologist*, 35, 51–62.

- Shafiee, S. (2020). Contribution of multiple intelligences to L2 writing of EFL learners. *International Journal of Linguistics, Literature and Translation*, 3(6), 59-69.
- Silwana, A., Subanji, S., Manyunu, M., & Rashahan, A. A. (2020). Students' responses leveling in solving mathematical problem based on solo taxonomy viewed from multiple intelligences. *Indonesian Journal on Learning and Advanced Education (IJOLAE)*, 3(1), 1– 16. <https://doi.org/10.23917/ijolae.v3i1.10528>
- Singer, M. (2006). A Cognitive Model for Developing a Competence-based Curriculum in Secondary Education. In: Al. Crisan (Ed.), *Current and Future Challenges in Curriculum Development: Policies, Practices and Networking for Change*. Bucharest: Humanitas Educational, 121-141.
- Skourdi, S.; Damavand, A.; Viyani, A. and Kashef, S. (2012). On the Relationship between Linguistic Intelligence and Vocabulary Knowledge among Iranian EFL Learners. *Iranian EFL Journal*, 8 (6), pp. 289—303.
- Smyth, J. (1998). Written emotional expression: Effect sizes, outcome types, and moderating variables. *Journal of Consulting and Clinical Psychology*, 66, 174–184.
- Sternberg, R. J. (2003). The theory of successful intelligence and its implications for language-aptitude testing. In *Individual differences and instructed language learning* (pp. 13-43). John Benjamins Publishing Company.
- Suartama, I. K., Sudarma, I. K., Sudatha, I. G. W., Sukmana, A. I. W. I. Y., & Susiani, K. (2024). Student engagement and academic achievement: The effect of gamification on case and project-based online learning. *Journal of Education and Learning (EduLearn)*, 18(3), 976– 990. <https://doi.org/10.11591/edulearn.v18i3.21349>
- Swales, J. (1990). *Genre analysis: English in academic and research settings*. Cambridge. UK: Cambridge university press
- Teele, S. (2000). *Rainbows of intelligence: Exploring how students learn*. California Corwin Press, INC.

- Widiastuti, N. P. K., Putrayasa, I. B., Pujawan, I. G. N., & Widian, I. W. (2024). Linguistic Intelligence: Improving Writing Ability through Mind Mapping of Project Based Learning. *International Journal of Language Education*, 8(3), 472-486.
- Willett, C. L. (2023). Why Correlation Doesn't Imply Causation: Improving Undergraduates Understanding of Research Design (*Doctoral dissertation*), University of Pittsburgh.
- YAMIN, M., SETIAWAN, S., & ANAM, S. U. (2023). Enhancing critical thinking to foster students' analytical capacity in academic writing. *International Journal of Language Studies*, 17(1).
- Yogatama, D., d'Autume, C. D. M., Connor, J., Kocisky, T., Chrzanowski, M., Kong, L., ... & Blunsom, P. (2019). Learning and evaluating general linguistic intelligence. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1901.11373*.

Appendices

Appendix 1 Functional Writing Test for Level 2 English Majors

Duration: 2 Hours **Total Marks:** 100

Instructions to Students:

- This test is designed to evaluate your functional writing skills in a variety of authentic contexts.
- You are required to complete all three tasks within the allocated time.
- Pay close attention to the instructions for each task, including the specified audience, purpose, and format.
- Your writing will be assessed on its clarity, coherence, accuracy, and adherence to the appropriate style, tone, and register.
- Please manage your time effectively to ensure you can complete all sections.

Task 1: Formal & Academic Communication (40 minutes, 30 marks)

Scenario: You are a Level 2 English major and you recently noticed an academic conference announcement on the departmental notice board that is highly relevant to your studies. However, the deadline to submit an abstract is fast approaching, and you need a letter of recommendation from your instructor, Dr. Salma. You need to formally request this letter and politely remind her of the tight deadline.

Instructions: Draft a formal email to Dr. Salma. Your email should:

- Use an appropriate and clear subject line.
- Include a polite and formal salutation.
- State your purpose clearly and concisely.
- Provide all the necessary details, including the conference name, the abstract submission deadline, and the specific requirements for the recommendation letter.
- Attach a draft of your abstract and your brief CV for his reference.
- End with a professional closing and your full name and student ID.

Task 2: Summarization & Critical Review (50 minutes, 40 marks)**A Guide to Reading Poetry**

Reading poetry can sometimes feel difficult, but it's really just a different way of using language. Unlike a novel that tells a long story or a textbook that gives you facts, a poem uses a small number of words to create a big feeling or idea. To understand poetry, you have to slow down and pay close attention to the details.

First, you should read the poem out loud. Hearing the words can help you notice things you might miss when reading silently. Listen to the rhythm, the sounds of the words, and where the lines break. This helps you get a sense of the poem's musicality. .

Next, don't just look for a single, hidden meaning. Instead, think about the **images** the poet creates. An image is a picture, sound, or feeling that the words bring to your mind. For example, in the line "the old house groans in the wind," you don't just see a house; you might hear a low, creaking sound and feel a sense of age or sadness. Poets use images to communicate powerful emotions without directly saying, "I feel sad."

Another key element is figurative language, which means using words in a non-literal way. Two common types are similes and metaphors. A simile compares two different things using the words "like" or "as." For example, "The clouds are like cotton candy." A metaphor directly states that one thing is another, without using "like" or "as." For example, "The clouds are cotton candy." Both of these tools help the poet make a point in a more creative and memorable way. .

Also, pay attention to the speaker of the poem. The speaker is not always the poet. It's the voice telling the poem. This voice could be a child, an old man, a historical figure, or even an object. Thinking about who is speaking can change your entire understanding of the poem's message.

Finally, don't worry if you don't "get" everything on the first try. Poetry is meant to be reread and thought about. Discussing it with others can also help you see new ideas and interpretations. The goal of reading

poetry isn't just to find one correct answer, but to experience the language and think deeply about the ideas and feelings it presents.

Instructions: Read the provided text and complete the following two parts.

Part A: Summary (15 minutes, 15 marks)

- Write a concise summary of the article, approximately 125-175 words.
- Your summary must accurately capture the author's main argument and key supporting points.
- Do not include your own opinions or interpretations in this section.

Part B: Critical Review (35 minutes, 25 marks)

- Write a critical review of the article, approximately 250-300 words.
- Analyze the author's arguments, methods, and evidence.
- Discuss the strengths and weaknesses of the article.
- Provide your own reasoned judgment on the article's contribution to the field.

Task 3: Practical Reporting & Informative Writing (30 minutes, 30 marks)

Scenario: You are a representative for your class, and a new department-wide student mentorship program is being launched. You have been asked to write an official announcement and an informational report to inform your classmates about the program.

Instructions: Complete the following two parts.

Part A: Official Announcement (10 minutes, 15 marks)

- Write a short, professional announcement (approximately 75 words) for the class notice board and departmental social media channels.
- The announcement should be clear, direct, and engaging.
- Include all crucial information: the name of the program, its purpose, how students can register, and the key benefits of participating.

Part B: Problem Report (20 minutes, 15 marks)

- Your class is experiencing a persistent issue with the classroom projector, which often overheats and shuts down during lectures.
- Write a formal problem report to the head of the department's technical support staff.
- The report should clearly describe the problem, provide specific examples of when it has occurred, explain the impact on learning, and conclude with a professional request for maintenance.

Scoring Guide for the FW Test

This scoring guide is designed to provide a systematic and objective framework for evaluating student performance on the Functional Writing Test. Each task is broken down into specific criteria with a clear allocation of marks.

Total Marks: 100**Task 1: Formal & Academic Communication (30 marks)**

This task assesses the student's ability to draft a formal email with a specific purpose and audience.

Criterion	Marks	Descriptors
Email Format & Adherence	5	5: Excellent use of formal email structure (subject line, salutation, closing, signature). 3-4: Minor errors in format or structure. 1-2: Several errors, or missing key components.
Clarity & Conciseness	5	5: Purpose is stated clearly and directly in the first paragraph. 3-4: Purpose is clear but could be more concise. 1-2: Purpose is vague or buried in the text.
Content & Completeness	10	9-10: Includes all necessary details (conference name, deadline, CV, abstract). 7-8: Minor details are missing or unclear. 5-6: Several important details are missing, making the request difficult to fulfill. 1-4: Fails to provide most of the required information.
Tone & Register	5	5: Tone is perfectly formal, polite, and respectful. 3-4: Tone is mostly formal but has minor lapses. 1-2: Tone is inappropriate (too casual, demanding, or vague).
Language	5	5: No significant errors in grammar, spelling,

Mechanics	punctuation, or sentence structure. 3-4: A few minor errors. 1-2: Several errors that impede readability.
-----------	---

Task 2: Summarization & Critical Review (40 marks)**Part A: Summary (15 marks)**

Criterion	Marks	Descriptors
Accuracy	5	5: Captures the main argument and all key supporting points. 3-4: Minor inaccuracies or misses one key point. 1-2: Fails to capture the main argument or is inaccurate.
Conciseness	5	5: Adheres to the word count (125-175 words) and avoids unnecessary detail. 3-4: Slightly over or under the word count; could be more concise. 1-2: Word count is significantly off, or the summary is too long/short.
Objectivity	5	5: The summary is purely objective, with no personal opinions. 3-4: Minor inclusion of personal opinion. 1-2: Contains significant personal interpretation.

Part B: Critical Review (25 marks)

Criterion	Marks	Descriptors
Analysis & Argumentation	10	9-10: Provides a sophisticated analysis of strengths and weaknesses with supporting arguments. 7-8: Identifies strengths/weaknesses but analysis is superficial. 5-6: Provides a basic summary rather than critical analysis. 1-4: Lacks critical analysis.
Reasoned Judgment	10	9-10: Offers a clear, well-supported, and original judgment on the article. 7-8: Judgment is present but lacks strong support. 5-6: Judgment is vague or not clearly connected to the analysis. 1-4: No reasoned judgment provided.
Language & Coherence	5	5: Uses appropriate academic language; structure is logical and coherent. 3-4: Language is adequate but lacks sophistication; minor issues with flow. 1-2: Language is simplistic, or structure is disorganized.

Task 3: Practical Reporting & Informative Writing (30 marks)**Part A: Official Announcement (15 marks)**

Criterion	Marks	Descriptors
Clarity & Directness	5	5: Clear, direct, and engaging language; easy to understand. 3-4: Minor issues with clarity. 1-2: Vague or confusing.

Completeness	5	5: Includes all crucial information (name, purpose, registration, benefits). 3-4: One key detail is missing. 1-2: Several key details are missing.
Tone & Register	5	5: Tone is professional, concise, and appropriate for the medium. 3-4: Minor lapses in tone. 1-2: Tone is inappropriate or unprofessional.

Part B: Problem Report (15 marks)

Criterion	Marks	Descriptors
Report Structure	5	5: Clearly follows the requested structure (problem, examples, impact, request). 3-4: Minor deviations from the structure. 1-2: Fails to follow a logical report structure.
Specificity	5	5: Provides specific, detailed examples and explains the impact clearly. 3-4: Examples are general or lack detail. 1-2: Lacks specific examples, making the report ineffective.
Professionalism	5	5: Tone is formal, respectful, and professional. 3-4: Tone is mostly appropriate but has minor lapses. 1-2: Tone is unprofessional or overly casual.

Appendix 2

Linguistic Intelligence Test for Level 2 English Majors

Duration: 2 Hours **Total Marks:** 100

Instructions to Students:

- This test is designed to evaluate your linguistic intelligence in a variety of contexts.
- You are required to complete all three tasks within the allocated time.
- Pay close attention to the instructions for each task, including the specified word count, audience, and purpose.
- Your writing and analysis will be assessed on clarity, coherence, accuracy, and the sophisticated use of language.
- Please manage your time effectively to ensure you can complete all sections.

Task 1: Advanced Lexical and Semantic Mastery (30 minutes, 20 marks)

Instructions: The following sentences contain idiomatic expressions, figurative language, or words with nuanced meanings. For each item, you must:

1. Explain the meaning of the underlined phrase or word as it is used in the context of the sentence.
2. Write a new, original sentence that uses the same phrase or word correctly.

Items:

1. The team's plan was a **shot in the dark**, but it paid off handsomely.
2. Her latest novel is a **tour de force** of narrative skill.
3. The professor's lecture on post-colonial theory was a **dense** and challenging exploration of the topic.
4. His political rhetoric was a **barrage** of empty promises.
5. She's very good at reading **between the lines** when a friend is upset.

Task 2: Sophisticated Written Communication (60 minutes, 40 marks)

Scenario: A recent article in a popular online magazine argues that English majors should prioritize technical and scientific writing over literary analysis to be competitive in the job market. You strongly disagree with this perspective.

Instructions: Write a persuasive essay, approximately 400-450 words, in response to this article. Your essay should:

- Clearly state your position and present a strong central argument.
- Use advanced syntax and varied sentence structures to present your ideas.
- Employ at least two different rhetorical devices (e.g., metaphor, analogy, rhetorical question) to make your argument more compelling.
- Maintain a formal but persuasive tone suitable for an academic journal or a well-respected online publication.
- Justify your counter-argument with logical reasoning and evidence.

Task 3: Critical Reading and Textual Analysis (30 minutes, 40 marks)

Scenario: Read the following short passage.

Understanding Point of View in Literature

In any story, the point of view is the perspective from which the story is told. It's the "lens" through which the reader sees the events, and the writer's choice of point of view greatly affects what we know and how we feel about the characters. There are a few main types of point of view that every student of literature should know.

First-Person Point of View

The most personal point of view is first-person, where a character within the story narrates it using pronouns like "I," "me," and "my." This perspective gives us direct access to that character's thoughts and feelings, creating a sense of intimacy and connection. However, the

reader only knows what the narrator knows; we are limited to their perspective and their biases. A famous example is from *To Kill a Mockingbird*: "When he was nearly thirteen, my brother Jem got his arm badly broken at the elbow."

Third-Person Limited

A third-person limited narrator is an outside voice that tells the story using "he," "she," or "they," but they focus on the thoughts and feelings of only one character. This is a very common point of view because it allows the writer to maintain some distance while still providing deep insight into a single character's mind. We know more than the other characters, but not everything about the entire world of the story.

Third-Person Omniscient

The most powerful point of view is third-person omniscient. The narrator is an all-knowing, outside voice who can enter the minds of any or all characters. This narrator knows everything about the past, present, and even the future. This allows the writer to create a broad picture of events, showing multiple perspectives and subplots at once. The narrator in *Pride and Prejudice* is a classic example of this all-knowing voice. Choosing the right point of view is one of the most important decisions a writer makes to shape a story.

Instructions: Answer the following questions based on the provided passage.

1. Describe the author's voice and perspective. What is their attitude towards the subject matter? Support your answer with specific textual evidence.
2. Identify and explain an underlying assumption the author makes about the reader or the subject matter.
3. Analyze a key sentence from the passage and explain how its syntax (its structure and word order) contributes to its meaning and the author's purpose.
4. What is one significant inference or implication that can be drawn from the text, even though it is not explicitly stated?

Scoring Guide for the Linguistic Intelligence Test

This scoring guide is designed to evaluate student performance on the Linguistic Intelligence Test. The focus is on the sophisticated use and analysis of language.

Total Marks: 100**Task 1: Advanced Lexical and Semantic Mastery (20 marks)**

This task has 5 items, each scored out of 4 marks.

Criterion	Marks per Item	Descriptors
Meaning Explanation	2	2: Correctly and accurately explains the meaning of the phrase in context. 1: Explanation is partially correct or lacks nuance. 0: Explanation is incorrect.
New Sentence	2	2: Creates an original and grammatically correct sentence that uses the phrase appropriately. 1: Sentence is grammatically correct but doesn't demonstrate a full understanding of the phrase's meaning. 0: Sentence is incorrect or not original.

Task 2: Sophisticated Written Communication (40 marks)

This task assesses the student's ability to construct a persuasive essay with advanced linguistic features.

Criterion	Marks	Descriptors
Argumentation & Reasoning	15	14-15: Presents a clear, compelling thesis with logical, well-supported arguments. 10-13: Argument is generally clear but may have minor logical gaps or weaker support. 6-9: Argument is vague or lacks a clear structure. 1-5: Fails to present a coherent argument.
Sophisticated Language Use	10	9-10: Excellent use of advanced vocabulary, varied sentence structures, and complex syntax. 7-8: Good use of varied syntax, but with occasional errors or repetition. 5-6: Sentences are simple; vocabulary is basic. 1-4: Significant errors in grammar or vocabulary that impede meaning.
Rhetorical Devices	10	9-10: Effectively and deliberately uses at least two rhetorical devices to enhance the argument. 7-8: Devices are present, but their use is not consistently effective. 5-6: Attempts to use devices but they are unclear or misused. 1-4: No rhetorical devices used.

Clarity & Coherence	5	5: Essay is well-organized with smooth transitions between paragraphs and ideas. 3-4: Essay is mostly organized, but some transitions are abrupt. 1-2: Essay lacks a clear organizational structure.
---------------------	---	--

Task 3: Critical Reading and Textual Analysis (40 marks)

This task has 4 questions, each scored out of 10 marks.

Criterion	Marks per Question	Descriptors
Question 1: Author's Voice	10	9-10: Correctly identifies the author's voice/perspective and supports with strong, specific textual evidence. 7-8: Identifies the voice but provides weak or general evidence. 5-6: Identifies the voice incorrectly or provides no evidence. 1-4: Fails to answer the question.
Question 2: Underlying Assumption	10	9-10: Correctly identifies and explains a valid, subtle assumption made by the author. 7-8: Identifies an assumption but the explanation is weak. 5-6: Identifies an obvious, stated point rather than an underlying assumption. 1-4: Fails to identify an assumption.
Question 3: Syntax Analysis	10	9-10: Selects a key sentence, accurately analyzes its syntax, and explains how it contributes to the author's purpose. 7-8: Analyzes syntax but fails to fully connect it to the author's purpose. 5-6: Describes the sentence but does not analyze its structure. 1-4: Fails to analyze syntax.
Question 4: Inference/Implication	10	9-10: Draws a significant and well-justified inference that is not explicitly stated in the text. 7-8: Draws a valid inference but justification is weak. 5-6: States something that is explicitly stated in the text. 1-4: Fails to draw an inference.