International Journal of Advanced Social Studies
ISSN: 3006-1776 (Print), 3006-1784 (Online)

Research Article

# An Exploration of Verbal-Linguistics Intelligence (VLI) Levels among Undergraduate English Students

Article History
Received: April 10, 2025
Revised: August 16, 2025
Accepted: August 21, 2025
Published: August 25, 2025

Usama Munawar [1], Mateen Iqbal [2,*], Masood Hussain Shah [2], Muhammad Abu Bakr [2]
[1] Institute of Education, University of Sargodha, Pakistan
[2] School Education Department, Government of the Punjab, Pakistan


*Corresponding Email: syedmateen92@yahoo.com
https://doi.org/10.70843/ijass.2025.05202

## Abstract

English play significant role in every aspect of humans, in studies and practical verbal skills that managed the numerous aspects of daily life. Verbal Linguistic Intelligence (VLI) also matters for English students because it helps students succeed academically, communicate better, and prepare for the future. Understanding or improving VLI can lead to better results and a more rewarding educational experience for English students. This paper explored the Verbal linguistic intelligence (VLI) levels amongst undergraduate English students in the Faculty of English department enrolled in Pakistani universities and gender-based comparison was made. Students of English departments of University of Sargodha were selected conveniently. Data were obtained using a self-report checklist of 10 items based on the Armstrong, (1993) multiple intelligence checklists which was pilot tested and Cronbach alpha value was found 0.89. Findings indicated that majority of students were characterized by the tendency of possessing good Verbal linguistics Intelligence (VLI) but not developed an equal appeal toward all language-oriented tasks. Analysis of VLI scores on gender based showed significant difference between in gender-based comparison. Female students are better than male students in VLI. It was concluded that male students' needs to receive more encouragement in their striving to have STEAM education.
Keywords: Verbal Linguistics intelligence (VLI), Undergraduate students, Gender-based comparison.

## Introduction

Verbal-linguistic intelligence (VLI) is the type of Intelligence or ability that allows a person to express ideas with the ability to use these excellently complicated concepts, and communicate different issues through reading, writing, listening, and speaking, according to Howard Gardner within his multiple intelligences. Subjects who are usually referred to as high scores in VLI often show ample terminologies along with a taste for language-oriented activities and very good performance in both expressive and receptive language functions. This transformation in our conception of human intelligence came about after Howard Gardner's revolutionary theory of multiple intelligences moved away from one single idea of cognitive ability. From the eight intelligences Gardner identified, verbal linguistic intelligence (VLI) is the most significant in the educational context, especially in the English language learning and literature studies (Gardner, 1983). As the ability to manipulate words easily and accurately, in both oral and written communication, VLI includes rhetorical skills, mnemonic capacity, skills in explaining, and metalinguistic awareness (Georgieva, 2020). This form of intelligence, very complex in nature, has caught the attention of most institutions of higher learning as particularly strong at the undergraduate level by students in the English department, as their linguistic competence is directly linked with their academic success and professional development. However, VLI in

such undergraduate college English education cannot simply be about language proficiency anymore. Recently empirical research has indicated that verbal linguistic intelligence has a significant mediating position among various cognitions and motivation factors that affect performance in academics (Mujiono, 2023)

According to Mujiono (2023) it has been determined in studies conducted with college students of English Education and Literature that there are highly positive correlations between VLI, academic engagement, and writing performance. Thus, it provides an implication that students with higher levels of verbal linguistic intelligence demonstrate a better ability to engage in academic writing tasks and analytical thinking processes. This relationship becomes particularly stronger when it comes to English departments since these students are also required to explore into literary texts more deeply, produce more advanced written analyses, and develop even higher communication skills with respect to mixed approaches. Here are the four primary dimensions of VLI that have recently become known with respect to undergraduate English students. information's the following (i) rhetorical ability, that is, the capacity to use language to persuade and influence; (ii) mnemonic ability, that is, the facility for recalling written and spoken information; (iii) explanatory ability, that is, the ability to convey information orally and in writing; and (iv) metalinguistic awareness, the ability to hold dialogues about and reflect on language itself (Erlina et al., 2019). All these aspects contribute to determining the academic effectiveness of students from the English department: from seminar discussions and presenting research results to writing finally persuasive argumentative essays and conducting a literary analysis.

Therefore, to understand detailed cognitive construct, researchers are using a variety of methodological approaches in the progressively complex assessment of VLI among undergraduate students. A tool for assessing VLI in educational research, the Multiple Intelligence Developmental Assessment Scales (MIDAS) offer thorough assessment of all of Gardner's intelligence domains (Mujiono, 2023). Nevertheless, there are advantages and disadvantages to using these evaluation instruments, particularly in English department settings. The difficulty of VLI calls for more detailed methods that can capture the dynamic interaction between cognitive capacities, motivational factors, and contextual variables that affect language learning and academic performance, even though quantitative measures offer insightful information about students' linguistic abilities. Additionally, VLI has been shown to have a strong correlation with self-directed learning and writing problem-solving techniques in cross-sectional studies involving a variety of university student populations (Mujiono, 2023).

## Literature Review

Verbal linguistic intelligence (VLI) is one of the intelligences at the theory of Howard Gardner's in multiple intelligences. It states the aptitude to manipulate language, both while communicating orally and in a written form Georgieva (2020). According to previous study intelligence is very much affiliated with all language-pursuing disciplines, especially with academic writing and self-directed learning, as shown through research that reveals significant evidence on its correlation to academic engagement and self-efficacy (Mujiono, 2023, 2024). VLI can empower excellent communication skills as well as improve analytical skills which is certainly salient in an educational environment that values the proficiency in language (Mujiono, 2023). Therefore, it makes sense that decoding VLI with Neuro-Linguistic Programming allows the creation of specific learning environments that accommodate various learning styles, thereby improving language development outcomes (Rahaman & Pattnaik, 2024). Thus, VLI transfers some weight in effective language use and some in strategy formulation areas for language teaching. Verbal Linguistic Intelligence is very important in any English department because it makes students academically successful, effective communicators, and useful members of society. Likewise, it equips the teacher with tools to facilitate development in students and guarantee that every student gets a fair chance to develop theirs. Fingering out VLI and improving it would mean improved results and more fun for everyone. In 1983, Howard Gardner thrust his theory of Multiple Intelligences (MI) into the spotlight with a premise that promised to shake the foundation of ideas on intelligence-that there existed several distinct modalities of human cognitive capacity, differentiating these from the classical

emphasis upon logical and linguistic abilities. In these contexts, verbal-linguistic intelligence is defined as the sensitivity to meaning, syntax, sound, and rhythm of words, which is very relevant in environments such as academia, where reading, writing, reasoning, and articulation are the mainstay of scholarly engagement. These academic practices are where this type of intelligence is in application-theory development, written analysis, and oral presentations. Many studies substantiate the contribution of MIs, inclusive of verbal-linguistics, towards achieving greater success in school and other disciplines. For instance, according to Safitri et al. (2023) reviewed in science education MI-based instruction, asserting that the integration of students' intelligence profiles can foster deeper engagement and achievement. And another research Maftoon and Sarem (2012) studied MI application in second language acquisition, showing how students with strong verbal-linguistic traits performed well on tasks dealing with discourse generation, grammar awareness, and vocabulary development. MI-based pedagogy, therefore, offers a means for diversifying instructional strategies-integrating reading-to-learn frameworks, rhetorical practices, and writing-to-learn tasks-as useful to activate students' linguistic strengths alongside complementary types of intelligences. In multilingual or Global South contexts, for example, universities in South Asia and the Middle East, MI-based strategies might scaffold academic discourse toward students moving between multiple linguistic lists through translanguaging, bilingual glossaries, and collaborative peer interaction. Thus, one could say that MI theory has attracted its share of criticisms. In this case it has been the psychometric strength and specificity of intelligence, especially verbal linguistic intelligence, which have come under question. Other aspects, including the difficulty in establishing a pure causal link between implementations of MI pedagogy and student achievement due to confounding factors and variations in its practical implementation, have also been widely discussed.

A strong relationship has been established between verbal linguistic intelligence and performance on reading tasks across various student groups as reported in multiple studies. For example, the relationship between linguistic intelligence and English achievement test scores was assessed to be quite strong and direct. Similarly, research conducted on Iranian EFL students showed that linguistic intelligence had a positive influence on their performance in different formats of reading comprehension tests: multiple-choice tests and the cloze method. Further, a study with the college students showed a moderate inter-correlation between verbal/linguistic and logical/mathematical intelligences, suggesting that teaching that combines varied intelligences could prove useful for fostering reading skills. Finally, some longitudinal investigations revealed a reciprocal relationship between reading comprehension and linguistic ability, indicating reading performance over time was predicted by these skills. Thus, sustains the argument of the indispensable role of verbal linguistic intelligence in facilitating reading ability formation across different contexts.

The educational background and its contribution to development of verbal linguistic intelligence in children are complexly consistent, as verified by various studies. Multiple Suggestions stated that early childhood educational linguistic proficiency is a great predictor of verbal naming speed; therefore, early experiences in education foster the development of verbal abilities (Hernández-Pérez et al., 2021). Mutualistic coupling theory suggests that the development of language abilities and that of non-verbal reasoning are interdependent, pointing to the premise that a solid educational front in language creates bases for other cognitive development (Griffiths et al., 2021)

However, cohort studies explored that linguistic comprehension and narrative skills in early childhood contribute uniquely to reading competence in later life; this underscores the significance of early educational interventions in developing verbal intelligence (Babayiğit et al., 2020). Genetic studies indicate a close relationship between vocabulary and grammar development, suggesting that educational environments that do foster language development may also promote children s development of grammatical knowledge (Dale et al., 2000). Overall, a strong educational background strongly nurtures verbal linguistic intelligence in children that helps them develop cognitively and academically (Fatimah, 2019).

## Statement of Problem

This research will be on the first-semester BS students of the University of Sargodha to exploring the levels of

verbal linguistics intelligences among the undergraduate students, This excludes the other semesters and institutions; therefore, a focused research study can be done on the Verbal Linguistics Intelligence profiles of undergraduate and their impact on the primary performance at the university.

## Theoretical Framework

The theoretical foundation of Verbal Linguistic Intelligence has been highlighted in Howard Gardner's Multiple Intelligences Theory (Gardner, 1983) that emphasizes the recognition of different cognitive capabilities in educational settings. This intelligence basically includes the reading, writing, and spoken areas as they are considered the preparatory ingredients for success in an academic setting. According to Gardner, intelligence is not a single concept but consists of many independent domains such as linguistic intelligence, which allows for different kinds of learning styles and teaching approaches to fit individual strengths (Avery, 1998). Verbal linguistic intelligence in the academic sense elevates the learning of languages, especially for foreign language learners, with activities that all intelligences incorporated for the experience of more integrative learning (Posada et al., 2017; Cordeiro, 2022). This methodology is said to be beneficial as it may support the creation of inclusive environments that fit the diverse profiles of learners towards a better educational experience and eventually personal development as well (Garmen et al., 2019).

### *Connection between Verbal Linguistics Intelligence (VLI) and Academic and Language Proficiency*

The theoretical connection linking verbal linguistic intelligence to academic language proficiency in pupils is multifarious, really emphasizing the relationship existing between cognitive skills and language competencies. Verbal linguistic intelligence could be measured by standardized tests, as opposed to academic language proficiency, which is a broader acquisition of competencies beyond vocabulary, also including the listening skills into comprehension to reading fluency (Angelis, 1999; Uccelli et al., 2015). Students with high verbal intelligence are more likely to perform better in academic language tasks requiring complex processing of structures and concepts that are critical for reading comprehension (Rodríguez et al., 2006; Kim et al., 2020). It focuses that for most interactions, students can learn how to speak quite fast, but for the learning of academic language necessary for academic achievement, it takes very long because this also depends on other influences that are both linguistic and cognitive (Rodríguez et al., 2006; Ranney , 2012). For students in the English department, who need to acquire the capacity for independent learning to understand difficult literary works, conducted independent research, and interact with difficult theoretical frameworks, this correlation is especially important. Verbal linguistic intelligence (VLI) is a foundational skill that supports many aspects of academic achievement in English studies, as demonstrated by the research showing that students with higher VLI levels show optimized analytical abilities and more efficient writing strategies. While the value of VLI in English instruction is becoming more widely acknowledged, there are still large gaps in both theoretical knowledge and real-world implementation. Small sample sizes, cross-sectional designs that hinder longitudinal tracking of VLI development, and a lack of focus on the diverse populations within English departments have all limited current research (Erlina et al., 2019). Thus, enhancing verbal linguistic intelligence through targeted instruction can significantly bolster academic language proficiency, supporting better academic outcomes.

Additionally, Research on the potential successful integration of VLI-based pedagogical interventions into current English curricula to improve student learning outcomes is clearly lacking. By examining the VLI levels among undergraduate English department students through a thorough analysis that takes consideration both quantitative measurements and qualitative insights, the current study overcomes these limitations. This study objectives to advance more advanced considerate of the ways verbal linguistic intelligence appears in academic English contexts by examining the distribution and traits of VLI within this population.

At the end, this study aims to offers helpful data that can guide curriculum design, teaching methods, and evaluation procedures in English departments, hopefully encouraging undergraduate students' academic achievement and professional growth in this key area of study. This study explored the Verbal Linguistics

intelligence levels amongst undergraduate students enrolled in the faculty of art and humanities at a Pakistani university.

### *Objective of the Study*

The research is guided by three main objectives: (i) to assess the overall level of VLI among these students, (ii) to examine any significant gender-based differences in VLI, and (iii) to determine whether the findings confirm or challenge prevailing societal beliefs about gender and languages aptitude.

### *Research Questions*

1. What are the levels of Verbal Linguistic intelligence (VLI) among undergraduate students in the Faculty of English Department?
2. Are there gender-based differences in VLI scores among undergraduate English department students?

## Methodology

The nature of the study was qualitative survey. The English department students of first semester of undergraduate programs was the sample of study from the University of Sargodha, Pakistan was selected as population of study. Through convenient sampling techniques, available students of English Department from faculty of Art and Humanities were selected for data collection. For data collection, the scale, developed by Armstrong (1993), consists of 80 items and comprised eight intelligences was adapted after seeking his permission through email. The 10 items checklist of Verbal Linguistics (V-L) form the original instrument of Multiple Intelligence of Armstrong (1993) was adapted and made bilingual (English & Urdu) for clear and better understanding of the students. The instrument was discussed with five experts with Ph.D. qualification and ample experience of teacher education and pilot tested on 100 students of the same population but not included in the actual sample. The Cronbach's alpha value for this adapted bilingual research instrument was 0.89 which is acceptable and very good.

Table 1. Reliability of verbal linguistics intelligence (vli) checklist.

| Instrument | Cronbach's Alpha | Decision |
|---|---|---|
| Verbal Linguistics Intelligence (VLI) Checklist | 0.89 | Very Good |

Table 1 shows the measurement instrument for Verbal Linguistic Intelligence (VLI) subjected to reliability assessment by means of Cronbach's Alpha. The value thus obtained, 0.89, indicates a very good internal consistency of the items within the scale of VLI. This shows that there is a high correlation among the questionnaire items in measuring the same underlying construct of verbal linguistic intelligence. In social sciences research, the value of Cronbach's Alpha greater than 0.80 is acceptable, and when the values approach 0.90, the instrument is highly dependable. Therefore, the reliability coefficient obtained in this study confirms beyond argument that the instrument was stable, trustworthy, and valid for measuring VLI in the study population.

Table 2. Results -verbal linguistic intelligence.

| Sr. No | Question | No f % | Yes f % | Total f % | Mean | S.D |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | Reading Book is enjoyment | 11 | 39 | 50 | 1.22 | 0.4184 |
| | | 22% | 78% | 100% | | |
| 2 | I have interest in history, English, and social studies. | 16 | 34 | 50 | 1.32 | 0.4712 |
| | | 32% | 68% | 100% | | |
| 3 | Used of words to change other minds. | 16 | 34 | 50 | 1.32 | 0.4712 |
| | | 32% | 68% | 100% | | |

| | | | | | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 4 | Self-Talking. | 3 | 47 | 50 | 1.06 | 0.2398 |
| | | 6% | 94% | 100% | | |
| 5 | Learning new words and meaning. | 4 | 46 | 50 | 1.08 | 0.2740 |
| | | 8% | 92% | 100% | | |
| 6 | Memorized things in class. | 17 | 33 | 50 | 1.34 | 0.4785 |
| | | 34% | 66% | 100% | | |
| 7 | Finding things in dictionary and encyclopedia. | 25 | 25 | 50 | 1.50 | 0.5050 |
| | | 50% | 50% | 100% | | |
| 8 | Spending time with family. | 17 | 33 | 50 | 1.34 | 0.4785 |
| | | 34% | 66% | 100% | | |
| 9 | Like prose writing. | 28 | 22 | 50 | 1.56 | 0.5014 |
| | | 56% | 44% | 100% | | |
| 10 | Stating situation in words. | 19 | 31 | 50 | 1.38 | 0.4903 |
| | | 38% | 62% | 100% | | |

Table 2 revealed that strong relationship amongst students toward reading, language learning, and verbal expression, though certain skills such as writing and use of reference materials present mixed patterns. Most 78% of students (mean = 1.22, SD = 0.4184) stated that they were enjoying reading books. This strong preference suggested that most students are comfortable engaging with written material, which is a foundational element for vocabulary growth and language mastery. 68% of students (mean = 1.32, SD = 0.4712) preferred English, Social Studies, and History than Math and Science. This indicated that a majority toward humanities-based subjects, where reading, writing, and verbal reasoning are emphasized. The percentage (68%) agreed they are good at using words to persuade others, pointing to developing verbal and interpersonal communication skills. (94 of students with the mean (1.06; SD 0.2398) take such behaviors into consideration as a personal habit; however, for these forms of behaviors, self-talk may act as a cognitive strategy for processing information, language rehearsal, and strengthening verbal reasoning skills. 92% of students (mean=1.08, SD=0.2740) agreed with the statement that they liked learning new vocabulary words and their meanings, clearly showing that they have a strong motivation to acquire vocabulary, which is essential for both expressive and receptive skills. Handsome value (66%) of the students (mean = 1.34, SD = 0.4785) stated that they had an easy time memorizing things in class, suggesting at least some verbal memory strength. Whereas, he same proportion (66%) stated that they usually prefer conversing with friends and family to watching TV. This may again enhance the skills needed for verbal fluency and interpersonal expression. Out of the students responding to the questionnaire, Half 50% of students liked looking up things in dictionaries or encyclopedias (mean = 1.50, SD = 0.5050). This would imply that while half of them dispose to look for information in formal reference sources, the other half may instead rely more on alternative learning methods-for example, having fun learning whether formally or informally-which implies either a lack of probably curiosity toward pursuing self-learning or an inability to search thoroughly. Handsome value 60% of students (mean = 1.56, SD = 0.5014) reported that they enjoyed creative writing activities such as stories, poems, and reports in this regard, while 44% did not. This may show that while a larger population represents the acceptance of written creative expression, almost one-half is lacking in interest or confidence to do long written assignments. However, 62% of students (mean = 1.38, SD = 0.4903) stated that to be good at describing words, a capability closely connected to successful communication. Certainly, since more than a third do not consider themselves skilled at this, it may indicate a deficiency level in the essentials of descriptive and narrative language that could be groomed through targeted practice.

Table 3. Gender based comparison of verbal linguistic intelligence.

| Intelligence | Gender | N | Mean | SD | T | df | P |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| VLI | Male | 7 | 12.7142 | 2.214670 | -.642 | 48 | .524 |
| | Female | 43 | 13.1860 | 1.735564 | | | |

Significance level < 0.05.

In Table 3, results indicated that there was no significant difference in Verbal Linguistic Intelligence between male and female students, with t-value (-0.642) and p-value (0.524), which is greater than the 0.05. This indicated that gender does not play significant role in shaping of VLI levels amongst the English students. This finding is consistent with the gender similarities hypothesis (Charlesworth & Banaji, 2019), which proposes nominal gender-based differences in cognitive abilities, including verbal and linguistic competencies.

## Discussion

This research had light on the perceptions & expressions of verbal linguistic intelligence (VLI) levels among undergraduate English students in Pakistan. The analysis provided indicated that most of students agreed the rational approach to writing skills, strategy use, pattern recognition in English, and interest as essential core variables of VLI across all 10 items. Considering previous studies, verbal linguistic Intelligence (VLI) finds its importance in giving favor to students in their academic journeys, especially while learning English (Mujiono, 2023; Mujiono, 2024). However, several aspects remain unexplored. For example, there is limited research showing how VLI directly affects writing abilities. Neuro-Linguistic Programming is mentioned as an adjunct to the VLI; it is, however, untested in practical classroom settings (Rahaman & Pattnaik, 2024). The research also lacks a fair share of attention directed towards how teachers develop and use the VLI construct for the students' learning process (Mujiono, 2023). More empirics is required to quantify the VLI context of English instruction in multilingual regions of South Asia and the Middle East (Safitri et al., 2023). However, some experts believe that the MI theory is not an acceptable measure of VLI, thus requiring further examination (Maftoon & Sarem 2012). The parallel among VLI and other skills, including math reasoning, while being understood, remains undiagnosed in terms of how they can be taught in unison. Early education is a vital period for the consolidation of verbal skills, and we need to better support that (Babayiğit et al., 2020). Nevertheless, we still have some way to go in aiding the VLI. It is difficult to say how the environment or genetics influence VLI. Genetics may contribute to the learning of grammar and vocabulary (Dale et al., 2000), but these contributions are not the complete picture. Studying these gaps may increase English language teaching and enhance learning for all.

## Conclusions

The major findings of this study revealed that most of the students surveyed had a solid foundation in verbal-linguistic ability. Most of the students enjoy reading books (78%), learning new words (92%), and talking to themselves (94%) all of which contribute positively toward vocabulary, comprehension, and thinking ability. Many students also enjoy subjects such as English, Social Studies, and History (68%) more than to pure sciences, and the same number feel confident using words to convince others. Thus, students were comfortable with languages and enjoying the ways of learning and using them in various forms.

About half of the students stated dictionaries or encyclopedias, which reflect that the habit of independent references has yet to be instilled in them. Another area of weakness is creative writing; only just under half (44%) said they enjoyed writing stories, poems, or reports. Similarly, about (62%) of students think they can describe things well, but many have doubts about doing this. Memory for class material is good, with two-thirds of the students saying that they can memorize it without much difficulty, while one-third have opposing views. The above patterns seem to suggest that while the students were performing better in receptive skills, such as reading and vocabulary learning, there was less productive skill development, particularly in creative

writing and descriptive writing. The gender-based analysis showed that there was no significance difference of verbal-linguistic intelligence amongst the male and female students. Male students with the (M= 12.71; SD = 2.21), while females were slightly higher with the (M= 13.19 ; SD = 1.73). However, the t-test shows that there is no significant difference (t = -0.642, p = 0.524). Therefore, they performed equally in verbal-linguistic Intelligence in terms of gender based. In the end, the students were strongly interested in language and communication (many a strong reader, and many also strong speakers). However, these strengths are not always probably attended by good written test scores or aptitude for studying independently. Preparations to this could be more activities that promote looking back at the references, writing creatively guided by an adult and a practice in describing down to details. Well, some regular, but small-sized tasks like writing prompts, word-of-the-day exercises and converting spoken to written can really help you all for potential performance. Students can shift from the place where they are most interested in language to a more balanced and confident verbal-linguistic profile. To build graduates' competence and adaptability in future language skills, universities need to embed task-based writing into their curriculum, pervading this with useful vocabulary development within structured, low-impact creative and descriptive writing assignments along with peer review workshop collaborations in writing-focused courses. In short, this dual approach cultivates strong reading habits and vocab development into confident, independent, and creative written expression while developing critical evaluation, constructive feedback, and iterative refinement skills in a supportive, structured environment.

## References

Angelis, P. J. (1999). Second language proficiency, foreign language aptitude, and intelligence: quantitative and qualitative analyses. Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 21(1), 161. https://doi.org/10.1017/S0272263199261062.

Armstrong, T. (1993). The multiple intelligences of reading and writing: Making the words come alive. Alexandria, USA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development. https://eric.ed.gov/?id=ED475460.

Avery, L. D. (1998). Book Reviews: Gardner, H. (1993). Creating Minds. NY: Basic Books. Gifted Child Quarterly, 42(2), 133–134. https://doi.org/10.1177/001698629804200208.

Babayiğit, S., Roulstone, S., & Wren, Y. (2020). Linguistic comprehension and narrative skills predict reading ability: A 9-year longitudinal study. British Journal of Educational Psychology, 91(1). https://doi.org/10.1111/bjep.12353.

Charlesworth, T. E. S., & Banaji, M. R. (2019). Gender in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics: Issues, Causes, and Solutions [Review of Gender in Science, Technology, Engineering, and Mathematics: Issues, Causes, and Solutions. Journal of Neuroscience, 39(37), 7228. Society for Neuroscience. https://doi.org/10.1523/jneurosci.0475-18.2019.

Cordeiro, D. M. (2022). Inteligencias múltiples: claves para su desarrollo en el aula de Español Lengua Extranjero para niños. Cultura, Lenguaje y Representación, 28, 29–44. https://doi.org/10.6035/clr.6359

Dale, P. S., Dionne, G., Eley, T. C., & Plomin, R. (2000). Lexical and grammatical development: a behavioural genetic perspective. Journal of Child Language, 27(3), 619–642. https://doi.org/10.1017/s0305000900004281.

Erlina, D., Marzulina, L., & Astrid, A. (2019). Linguistic intelligence of undergraduate EFL learners in higher education: A case study. Journal of Language and Education, 15(2), 87-103.

Fatimah, S. (2019). The effect of verbal-linguistic intelligence and emotional intelligence on academic achievement of Indonesian EFL learners. International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research, 18(12), 350-365. https://doi.org/10.26803/ijlter.18.12.20.

Gardner, H. (1983). Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences. Basic Books.

Garmen, P., Rodriguez, C., Garcia-Redondo, P., & San-Pedro-Veledo, J. C. (2019). Multiple Intelligences and Video Games: Assessment and Intervention with TOI Software. Comunicar: Media Education Research

Journal, 27(58), 95-104.

Georgieva, P. (2020). Linguistic Intelligence. Diogenes, 28(1). https://doi.org/10.54664/nihr6544.

Griffiths, S., Kievit, R. A., & Norbury, C. (2021). Mutualistic coupling of vocabulary and non-verbal reasoning in children with and without language disorder. Developmental Science, Developmental Science, 25(3). https://doi.org/10.1111/desc.13208.

Hernández-Pérez, E., Rabadán-Rubio, J., Cayuelas-Abellán, D., Giorgi, A., & Gallego-Martínez, A. (2021). Linguistic Competence in Early Childhood Education as a Predictor of Verbal Naming Speed. Psicothema, 4(33), 610–616. https://doi.org/10.7334/psicothema2020.180.

Kim, Y.S. G., Petscher, Y., Uccelli, P., & Kelcey, B. (2020). Academic language and listening comprehension—Two sides of the same coin? An empirical examination of their dimensionality, relations to reading comprehension, and assessment modality. Journal of Educational Psychology, 112(7), 1367–1387. https://doi.org/10.1037/EDU0000430.

Maftoon, P., & Sarem, N. S. (2012). The realization of Gardner's multiple intelligences theory in second language acquisition. Journal of Language Teaching and Research, 3(6), 1233–1239. https://doi.org/10.4304/jltr.3.6.1233-1239.

Mujiono, M. (2023). Verbal Linguistics Intelligence and Self-Directed Learning in EFL Writing Problem Solving: A Study of Grit's Mediating Influence. Indonesian Journal of EFL and Linguistics, Indonesian Journal of EFL and Linguistics, 8(2), 245-261((2), 245-261), 247–262. https://doi.org/10.21462/ijefl.v8i2.703.

Mujiono. (2024). The Mediating Role of Verbal Linguistic Intelligence in the Impact of Self-Efficacy and Academic Engagement on Academic Flow in Academic Writing. Journal of Higher Education Theory and Practice, 23(20). https://doi.org/10.33423/jhetp.v23i20.6694.

Posada, L. E., Varela Londoño, S. P., & Rodríguez Burgos, L. P. (2017). Multiple Intelligences and Curriculum Implementation: Progress, Trends and Opportunities // Inteligencias múltiples e implementación del currículo: Avances, tendencias y oportunidades. Revista De Psicodidactica, 22(1). https://ojs.ehu.eus/index.php/psicodidactica/article/download/15614/18003.

Rahaman, A., & p p Pattnaik. (2024). Integrating Neuro-Linguistic Programming and Multiple Intelligences in Language Learning: A Bridge between Theory and Practice. https://doi.org/10.53555/kuey.v30i2.1627.

Ranney, S. (2012). Defining and Teaching Academic Language: Developments in K-12 ESL. Language and Linguistics Compass, 6(9), 560–574. https://doi.org/10.1002/LNC3.354.

Rodríguez, W., Ochoa, S. H., & Parker, R. I. (2006). The Crosslinguistic Role of Cognitive Academic Language Proficiency on Reading Growth in Spanish and English. Bilingual Research Journal, 30(1), 87–106. https://doi.org/10.1080/15235882.2006.10162867.

Safitri, D. A., Suyatna, A., & Susanti, R. (2023). Implementation of multiple intelligences-based learning in science education: A literature review. Journal of Physics: Conference Series, 2600, 012021. https://doi.org/10.1088/1742-6596/2600/1/012021.

Uccelli, P., Galloway, E. P., Barr, C. D., Meneses, A., & Dobbs, C. L. (2015). Beyond Vocabulary: Exploring Cross-Disciplinary Academic-Language Proficiency and Its Association with Reading Comprehension. Reading Research Quarterly, 50(3), 337–356. https://doi.org/10.1002/RRQ.104.