Analyzing Emotional Intelligence and Intercultural Sensitivity among Monolingual and Multilingual University Students in India

[1]Dr.Mitashree Tripathy [2]Saptasindhu Panda

[1]Assistant Professor, Birla Global University, Bhubaneswar, India

[2]Assistant Manager, Axis Bank Ltd. Raipur, India

Email: mitashreetripathy84@gmail.com

Abstract

Background: Studies reveal that, university students are expected to be well versed in multiple languages, posses a greater degree of emotional intelligence and be highly sensible towards intercultural differences in today's globalizing world.

Objectives: The primary objective of this paper is to assess whether multilingual students have higher emotional intelligence and intercultural sensitivity as compared to monolingual students.

Methods: The methodology adopted for the study included data collected from university students from various disciplines and diverse cultures through a questionnaire in an electronic survey providing questions relating to the participant's proficiency in language, scale measuring emotional intelligence and intercultural sensitivity. The questionnaire was based on TEIQue- SF (Petrides, 2009) that included Trait Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire Short Form that comprised of 30 questions and Intercultural Sensitivity Scale (Chen and Starosta, 2000) that consisted of 24 items on a Likert scale of 7 points and 5 point scale respectively. Cronbach's Alpha was performed to find the reliability between the variables and t test was run where the means of the two samples assuming unequal variances were compared to check the hypothesis.

Results: Results indicated that multilingual university students have high emotional intelligence in comparison to monolingual students. However, there is no significant relation of intercultural sensitivity among multilingual and monolingual students.

Conclusions: University students need to prepare for careers that include diverse workplaces. Their ability to learn more than one language will enable them to connect, relate and collaborate with people developing strong interpersonal relationships that further would engage them in various future assignments helping them grow in their career. Further, this study may help develop emotional intelligence among students by accepting it as a prime focus in university curricula, imparting training and development programs during academia and encouraging continuous self- assessment among the students.

Keywords: Language, Monolingual, Multilingual, Emotional Intelligence, Intercultural Sensitivity, University Students

1. Introduction

Language plays a pivotal role in our life. The structure of a particular language exemplifies the universal forms of human thought processes. However, the pursuit of studying, understanding and defining language suggests that it is the means of communication. Exploring deeper into the study, language may be considered as an ability that helps an individual to express and understand feelings and emotions. Unlike animals who communicate through various sounds like cries and yells, humans communicate through "speech that is made up of discrete units which loosely speaking corresponds to vowel and consonant sounds" (Donnelly, 1994, p. 4). Considering the ability to learn, humans may have received it through inherited dispositions, however, language is learned through communication with people in the society. It grows just through communication. Studies suggest that "society and environment create a great impact on language acquisition especially on children" (Hemmeter and Kaiser, 1990, p. 331) who can learn language naturally and effortlessly. They are quick learners. If a child is brought up in a society where a certain language is never used, the child would face difficulties in learning the language as he grows up. Social interaction, however, makes the environment rich enough with the language that possibly assists the child to nurture growth and learn the language. This means that language is socially dependent and that all speakers within the society are bound by a system of rules governing language which ensures that the language is properly communicated. Thus, defining language is a complicated task as many definitions revolve around the essence of language and what its impact is. However, Gonzalez defines language as the aqueduct "through which one finds answers to questions about people's identities and experiences" (Gonzalez, 2008, p. 429). Huyssteen states that the evolution of language paved the path to this virtual world. Huyssteen affirms "only humans communicate with language, and this unique form of communication is special and far more precise and rapid than any other kind of communication" (Huyssteen, 2006, p. 234). Hence, language has been understood to be more than simply a system of communication. More ideas on how language shapes an individual's perception has also been discussed by various authors of which the Sapir- Whorf hypothesis on human's perception of language towards various cultures is the most important as it tends to drag the attention of many philosophers and linguists that represents "there has to be some connection between a language and the way people think, behave and perceive the world around them" (Giesbrecht, 2009, p. 2). Chomsky's views on the language-system studies a perspective of cognitive capacity that holds language as one among the various cognitive capacities. Chomsky affirms that "by studying the properties of natural languages, their structure, organisation, and use, we may hope to learn something about human nature; something significant, if it is true that human cognitive capacity is the truly distinctive and most remarkable characteristic of the species" (Chomsky, 1975, p. 4). Further arguments relating to language can be elaborated by Kramsch and Widdowson who looked into the correlation between culture and language and believed that language represents the reality of a culture as they state "speakers identify themselves and others through their use of language; they view their language as a symbol of their social identity" (Kramsch and Widdowson, 2011, p. 3). Furthermore, Piller affirms language is the unswerving expression of any culture. He goes on to say "once a language has become

accepted as a fact- once it has been named, described and codified in grammars and dictionaries- the relationship between that language and that culture seems self-evident" (Piller, 2011, p. 52). However, the fact that each culture has its language and individuals who are brought up in a specific culture, normally build up the competence to communicate in that culture's language. Speaking in one's first language is a subliminal demonstration. Be that as it may, figuring out how to utilize another dialect isn't a concealed act and can in reality be difficult to learn. Numerous studies have identified and argued that "emotional intelligence is a factor in second language learning" (Eyraud, Giles, Koenig and Stoller, 2000, p. 53). These studies are not only interpretative but also optimistic that an individual with emotional intelligence can effortlessly learn a second language.

While many authors believe that the prime purpose of the language is communication, Hughes and Lavery propose a different view. They characterize language as a means to communicate but they also view this to be not very informative. They specify "when we use language we almost always communicate something to someone, but usually our purpose is much more specific, and frequently we are not concerned with communicating information at all" (Hughes and Larvey, 2004, p. 39). They further mention that our purpose simply does not restrict to communicate rather to communicate for a certain cause. During communication we tend to reveal our causes. Subsequently, the way we interpret the dialogue of others and reciprocate to others' communication is the result of our being intelligent emotionally. And if we agree to Dwyer and Hopwood's inspection, we discover that they defend emotional intelligence and state that "improving emotional intelligence requires a person to think about their reactions and to think about the reactions of others, weigh up the pros and cons of a situation and possible responses, and then to respond appropriately" (Dwyer and Hopwood, 2020, p. 32). Thus emotional intelligence is an act of taking up the responsibility and monitoring emotions and actions towards people and situations.

2. Literature Review

Shifting conditions of globalization have instigated and augmented multilingualism. Several studies claim both positive and negative impacts of globalization on multilingualism. However, the positive impact is a more visible phenomenon as "globalization has impacted multilingualism positively by giving birth to politics of global linguistics diversity" (Ndimele & Emenanjọ, 2019, p. 4). Globalization has thus facilitated this diversity and the shift from the conventional existing concepts of interaction in one language to that of interaction in multiple languages has been considered as a norm rather than just an exception. Multilingualism thus is "an ability to communicate both generally and specifically, in more than one language which as a competence relates to the personal and social development of the individual" (Romanowski and Bandura, 2019, p. 218). Learning does not transpire in seclusion. Otherwise stated, learning is not only correlated to cognitive factor, but also to emotions that play a pivotal role. "While personal competencies include autonomy, prepared for lifelong learning, quality control and professional responsibility" (Angelone, Ehrensberger-Dow, & Massey, 2019, p. 69), they also prepare an individual, especially the students to grow academically, and socially. Although, it's not easy to immerse in another culture, however, "a competent intercultural communicator is one who is able to and interact

effectively in a culture other than his or her own" (Samovar, Porter, & McDaniel, 2009, p. 379). Of course, personal competence prompts an individual to move from one cultural setting to another, to learn languages, to adjust to various changes both socially and emotionally, however, intercultural effectiveness in communication is much more than that. It "indicates the right quantity of message sending, the consistent quality of message delivery, the relevancy of the topical message and situation, and the manner of expression" (Chen, 1990, p. 245) thus requiring greater accountability of intermediating and interpreting messages which is not a simple matter.

Knowing and being able to use more than one language enable an individual to navigate more or less as a native and enhances abilities to overcome diversities, however, knowing the language and learning its linguistic elements can be stressful. While learning a second language it is obvious for the individual to develop conflicting emotions. Studies reveal that learning a second language can instigate positive feelings such as happiness, eagerness, fulfilment, and warmth and can so also originate less pleasant feelings like dissatisfaction, antagonism, apprehension, lack of self-confidence that can have a massive impact to emotions. (López, 2011, pp. 43-44). More recent studies detail that "learners vary in how successfully they can learn a second language" (Aliasin and Abassi, 2020, p. 32). Dios calls it a general feeling that arises from multiple stimuli. He describes "for everyone in the classroom setting, a cenesthetic sense not only defines the current acceptance or rejection of the situation, but is also recorded in memory, sometimes with long-term emotional influence" (Dios, 2018, p. 58). A great number of studies have emphasized on the efficacy of psychological factors and social measurements of differences among learners (Krashen, 1981, 1982; Fahim and Pishghadam, 2007; Pishghadam, 2009). One of many such studies states that learning a second language requires one's acceptance of the psychological aspects in learning. These psychological aspects of learning can either hamper or facilitate in establishing the success of the cognitive expansion of students in an educational setting that comprises of students from various cultural backgrounds. Zafari and Biria describe "over the past three decades, there has been an increasing interest in finding the nature of learning strategies and identifying those strategies that are most commonly used by different types of learners" (Zafari and Biria, 2014, p. 1967). Learning strategies are any manner or "strategy to be adapted in order to achieve the main purpose of learning" (Hardan, 2013, p. 1713). Among anything else, learning strategies signify the 'what' and 'how' to use for learning. Better definition of learning strategy described that learning strategies are "specific actions taken by the learner to make learning easier, faster, more enjoyable, more self-directed, more effective, and more transferable to new situations" (Oxford, 1990, p.8). Such specific actions depict that learning strategies are "influenced by different cognitive variables, among which emotional intelligence and learning strategies are considered the most important ones" (Taheri and Jadidi, 2016, p. 953). The incorporation of emotional intelligence in the acquisition of new languages is analyzed through various approaches and has always been an area of interest for researchers and scholars to determine the same. Thus knitting it all together, it can be concluded that both cognitive and emotional factors are radical in the process of acquisitioning a new language. To which Dewaele clarifies that "emotions play a crucial part in the lives of monolinguals and multilinguals" (Dewaele, 2010, p. 1).

Although studies suggest that there is no particular definition of emotional intelligence and that there are "substantial disagreements exist among researchers on exactly what terminology to use and how much of a person's behavior can be affected by emotional intelligence" (Alias in and Abassi, 2020, p. 33) at present there exist three models of EI namely, The Ability Model (Salavoy and Mayer, 1990), The Trait Model (Petrides and Furnham, 2001) and The Mixed Model (Goleman, 1995). While The Ability Model claims that emotions are constructive during social interactions and relationships building, The Trait Model projected on personality and The Mixed Model proposed a blend of "emotional intelligence qualities with other personality traits that are not related to emotion, intelligence or emotional intelligence, rather examined cognitive mental abilities as well as non-cognitive personality traits" (p. 32). Overall, Emotional Intelligence is an ability to recognize, analyze and understand emotions not only of one's own but also of others. People with a high degree of emotional intelligence are more stable, distinct and can control over any situations in life. They are more prolific and content. They are good listeners and they know exactly how their emotions are going to affect people around them. Such people value relationships and they tend to prosper in their life. In his book Goleman states "people with well- developed emotional skills are more likely to be content and effective in their lives, mastering the habits of mind that foster their own productivity; people who cannot marshal some control over their emotional life fight inner battles that sabotage their ability for focused work and clear thought." (Goleman, 1996, p. 36) People with good EI can relate well with others hence building a relationship of trust and confidentiality because they have complete control over their emotions and they understand equally well what their feelings mean. The comprehension of their own feelings thus opens a gateway to maintain peaceful relations with others. Goleman introduced five major key skills of emotional intelligence and believed that one who has conquered over these five components of emotions tend to be an effective leader and an unprecedented personality that include self-awareness, self-regulation, self-motivation, empathy and social skills.

However, the current study is based on the psychometric properties of "Trait Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire that deals with Well-being, Self-control, Emotionality and Sociability" (Petrides, 2009, p. 89) where well-being refers to feelings of positivity, happiness and contentment, self control refers to the level of control over impulses, pressures, urges, desires and drives. Similarly, emotionality denotes the degree of awareness of one's own feelings and that of others along with perception and expressions of emotions by developing and sustaining important relationships. On the other hand, sociability calls for attention to social relationships and social influences. It is otherwise different from emotionality as its main focus is on social contexts rather than on personal relationships. This trait theory "conceptualises emotional intelligence as a personality trait, located at the lower levels of personality hierarchies" (Stough, Saklofske and Parker, 2009, p. 88).

Being self-aware is one among the many techniques that assist in learning a second language. Dodigovic determines "the learners are supposed to bring in a positive approach, comprising some empathy for L2, belief in their own success, an open attitude to the new academic environment and being willing to engage in a number of learning practices" (Dodigovic,

2005, p. 33). These skills and techniques are identified with self-awareness that is an ability to identify and inspect one's strengths and weaknesses, fears and anxieties. Dalton, Hoyle and Watts provide strategies that one can attain in order to improve one can attain to improve self-awareness. They write, "being aware of your own perceptions and what influences them is extremely important. With this awareness, you can withhold judgments until you have analyzed a situation. You can ask yourself why you are feeling the way you are, whether your feelings are justified, and whether you should act on those feelings" (Dalton, Hoyle and Watts, 2010, p. 39). So also while learning a new language "Other competences of self-regulation are, the reliability to cope with changes and achieving innovation so that students feel comfortable with new ideas, approaches and information presented in class L2" (Moilla-Garcia, 2017, p. 31).

Although individuals are aware of their strengths and weaknesses, they have various motivations to learn a language. Ehman elucidates this motivation can be intrinsic where the drive to satisfy personal reasons can be one among the causes, and extrinsic where the motivation desires for benefits or to meet certain requirements. However, Ehman describes "intrinsic motivation is very powerful and is likely to lead to deep learning because an intrinsically motivated learner will take every opportunity to satisfy the motivation-driven needs to expand and deepen knowledge" (Ehman, 1996, p. 137). Both intrinsic and extrinsic motivations come under one of the components of emotional intelligence. The need to learn a new language can be both intrinsic, where an individual wishes to improve and acquire command over it with the intention to perform or participate in an activity or gel better with a new group of people, and can be extrinsic where an individual is expecting recognition or wants to avoid any kind of unwanted situation.

The ability to learn a language varies enormously based on the learners. There are learners who easily learn a second language and there are learners who acquire knowledge with greater difficulty but "it seems that one important factor which accounts for success in language learning is the degree of intelligence that individual possess" (Pishghadam, 2009, p. 31) and this is emotional intelligence. Similarly, Zarafshan and Ardeshiri also explored the impact of emotional intelligence in learning a second language where the studies revealed "meta-cognitive, affective and social learning strategies, in addition to emotional intelligence, contributed positively in developing language proficiency" (Zarafshan and Ardeshiri, 2012, p. 9). Furthermore, Ellis clarifies that in the current scenario of globalization "(bi) multilingualism is the norm whereas monolingualism is the exception" (Ellis, 2008, p. 311).

Exploring the intervention of emotions in acquisitioning a second language is not an emerging area of research. Several methodologies that distinctively concentrate on emotional and psychological issues involved in the learning of a second language have already been utilized. One among such methodologies was Krashen's Monitor Model where Krashen argued that "acquisition is a more important process of constructing the system of a language than learning because fluency in L2 performance is due to what we have acquired not what we have learned" (Krashen, 1982, p. 10). It is however true that those individuals who try to communicate in a different language tend to feel differently. Moreover, Ozanska-Ponikwia felt that "learning a second language is related with emotion expression, empathy, social

awareness, emotion perception, emotion management, and emotionality and sociability traits" (Ozanska-Ponikwia, 2018, p. 39). For instance, individuals who felt differently when speaking in another language stated change in their body language and facial expressions and paralinguistic features like volume, intonation and word stress. These traits of emotional intelligence influence the perception of any changes in behaviour while learning a new language. Findings prove that individuals with high degree of emotional intelligence were better equipped to notice the changes in their behaviours while learning or speaking a new language.

Languages and cultures are interdependent. Language plays a pivotal role not only in the building of a culture, but in the emergence of cultural change. Culture is identified by members of a social group that has acquired a common way of perception developed through communication over a period of time with other members of the group. Institutions like family, schools and, workplaces, assist in socializing and sharing commonness through the use of language. Several authors illustrate "the notion of speech community composed of people who use the same linguistic code, can speak of discourse communities to refer to the common ways in which members of a social group use language to meet their social needs" (Kramsch and Widdowson, 1998, p. 6-7). This correlates the fact that if an individual is trying to learn a foreign language, the interest in learning about a different culture grows as well. The individual's interest to learn a foreign language would motivate the individual to explore deeper into that culture and may also make the individual culturally sensitive. The language learning dimension unveils various unfamiliar grounds for many language learners. Situations may stimulate negative emotions and stress. This is the reason why having a high level of emotional intelligence plays a pivotal role in learning a foreign language. Additionally, individuals with high level of emotional intelligence have the added advantage of being eager to learn more and achieve satisfaction in successfully participating in the globalizing world.

Empirical studies suggest that emotional intelligence is related directly to this field of intercultural sensitivity (Jansen and Riemer, 2002, p. 53). Mostly, students in their growing years are required to incorporate intercultural education through appropriate channels. As mentioned by Fall et al. that "students need to be coached in emotional intelligence in preparation before engaging in intercultural learning" (Steventon, Cureton, & Clouder, 2016, p. 58). Continuous coaching and evaluation of intercultural education and learning will help build better views regarding various cultures. This would stimulate the analysis of various emotional cues that have the potential to be interpreted among the students to comprehend cultures better. Many authors agree that "emotional cues are necessarily embodied within linguistic and non-linguistic messages and are therefore a core part of the meaning-making process which needs to be negotiated" (Guntersdorfer and Golubeva, 2018, p. 55). It not only promotes willingness among the individuals when they first come in contact with people from other cultures, but also to understand them that gets initiated through their self awareness thereby providing them with aids to move ahead to interact with people of vaying cultures through self motivation. It also instigates feelings of realization, acceptance and a respectful approach towards cultural differences. Pertinent to this, the relevance of empathy

emphasizes on the ethno-relative view of the intercultural development that is being "able to move between multiple frames of reference, without losing your identity with great cultural flexibility and respect" (Nunez, 2018, p. 69) through social skills.

This study however reflects the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale as developed by Chen and Starosta that embeds intercultural attitude and behavioural skills. The model includes subscales that include "Interaction Engagement, Respect for Cultural Differences, Interaction Confidence, Interaction Enjoyment, and Interaction Attentiveness" (Chen and Starosta, 2000, p. 7) where "interaction engagement symbolises the degree of participation in the intercultural communication, respect for cultural differences denote to realise, accept and respect for others' cultural diversities in the communication, interaction confidence relates to how confident the interlocutors perform during intercultural communication and interaction attentiveness symbioses the ability of receiving and responding to the messages properly during the intercultural communication" (Wu, 2015, p. 2).

3. Hypotheses

The main objective of the paper is to determine the establishment of having proficiency in multiple languages, emotional intelligence and cultural sensitivity. The study mainly emphasized two major aspects considering the correlation of three variables. Primarily, the study determined the link between emotional intelligence and language. Secondly, the study attempted to establish the relationship between intercultural sensitivity and language. The present study diverges from the subsequent research that viewed emotional intelligence as the independent variable. However, the current study takes language proficiency as an independent variable whereas the dependent variables are emotional intelligence and intercultural sensitivity. In addition to this, the current study attempts to determine an establishment among all the three variables of language, emotional intelligence and intercultural sensitivity.

Based on the theoretical argumentation, following hypotheses may be proposed.

H1 If a student is proficient in more than one language or is multilingual, then he or she would have a higher emotional intelligence than a monolingual or a student who knows only one language.

H2 If a student is proficient in more than one language then he or she would have a higher level of intercultural sensitivity than a student who has proficiency in only one language.

4. Methodology

Participants

Participants in the study were selected from India. Participants were students chosen through convenience sampling for the study from various disciplines, both from masters and undergraduates from a university that accommodates a large of students from various parts of the globe. However, particularly for this study, participants were chosen from various parts of India to ensure that a relative number of students who are multilinguals would be interested in participating as one of the variables of the study is students knowledge of languages.

Further, an email with the link describing a brief about the study was distributed to the students. The sample of the present study consisted of 182 participants. Of them, 108 (59.34%) were male and 74 (40.66%) were female. Of those sampled, 29 (15.93%) were monolinguals and 153 (84.06%) were multilinguals. Of the participants, 52 (28.57%) were from Odisha and 130 (71.43%) were from different states of India.. The participants' ranged in age from 18 to 29, with a mean of 23.5, a standard deviation of 1.431, and a range of 48 (26.37%) of participants' first languages, the most prominent native language was Hindi. The second most prominent language was Odiya, 37 (20.33%) which is the language of Odisha; as an obvious fact because the university is established in Odisha and it attracts both the regional and local students. The most common foreign languages spoken by participants were English. Of the participants, 97 (53.3%) spoke English. Most of the participants were not third culture kids (TCKs), with only 4 (2.2%) being TCKs, 161 (88.46%) not being a TCK, and 17 (9.34%) participants unsure of whether or not they were a TCK. TCK or the Third Culture Kids was first coined by Useem who defined TCKs as "children who accompany their parents into another society" (Zilber, 2009, p. 18) and that was further defined by Pollock as "a person who has spent a significant part of his or her developmental years outside the parents' culture" (Pollock, Reken & Pollock, 2017, p. 2). Due to the exposure of various countries and cultures these third culture kids develop a potentiality to learn more than one language. The significance of including a question relating to the TCK is to simply find out whether their implementation of multiple languages can really help develop and assess emotional intelligence and intercultural sensitivity. When participants were asked if they formally studied the foreign languages they knew, 47 (32.87%) of participants reported they formally studied the foreign languages. Most participants, 59 (41.26%), were fluent in foreign language they knew. Participants who knew foreign language, 7 (4.90%) were beginners with an average of 30 (20.97 %).

Research Instruments

Research instrument adopted here in this study included a questionnaire consisting of a set of questions intended to collect responses from the respondents in a structured format. The questions asked were error free, jargon free and used in simple language so that the respondents were able to understand and respond to them in a meaningful way. The participants for the study were briefed regarding the study through a letter of introduction which gave them confidence to answer the question in the questionnaire, assuring them that the details they provide will be kept confidential without affecting their privacy. That is the reason 'name' was not included in the criteria of demographic questions. This was done keeping in view the ethical considerations while doing a research. The survey was divided into three-parts in order to measure three fields to study, i.e., participants' knowledge of language, second criteria being emotional intelligence and the third one intercultural sensitivity. The first survey encouraged the participants to answer a series of demographic questions pertaining to their awareness and comprehension of other languages. The demographic questions comprised of one's age, sex, nationality and the country they grew up. Other questions consisted of participants' language proficiency like whether they spoke different languages and if they have received formal coaching or training or studied it. The

second parameter of emotional intelligence was measured by TEIQue- SF (Petrides, 2009) that include i.e. Trait Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire Short Form that comprised of 30 questions that are required to be responded using a Likert scale, a 7 point scale where 1 denotes participants' complete disagreement and 7 specifying complete agreement. The questions were assessed related to the level of emotional intelligence among students. The third survey dealt with the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale (Chen and Starosta, 2000) again a Likert scale, a 5 point scale that measured how sensitive the management students are towards various cultures. The scale to measure the intercultural sensitivity consisted of 24 items that were responded using a point scale where 5 indicated strong agreement and 1 denoted strong disagreement, including subscales that provide a clear comprehension of management students' intercultural sensitivity where interaction engagement applies to the comfort one finds in engaging oneself in interacting with students from various cultural backgrounds. Similarly, the next scale 'respect for cultural differences' quantifies the respect that students have for various cultures. The next scale 'interaction confidence' determines how confident they are in communicating with various culturally different individuals. The next scale 'interaction enjoyment' assess whether students really enjoy talking to students from other cultures and finally 'interaction attentiveness' measures respondents' care and attentiveness intercultural interactions.

Data Reliability and Validity

Before analyzing the questionnaire, the reliability analysis was conducted through SPSS to check the reliability of the items in the questionnaire. To check the levels of language, emotional intelligence and intercultural sensitivity Cronbach's Alpha was performed and the values demonstrated that the reliability level was found to be 0.801 as illustrated in Table 1.

Table-1

Case Processing Summary & Reliability Statistics

		N	**%**
Cases	**Valid**	182	100.0
	Excluded*	0	0
	Total	182	100.0

*List wise deletion based on all variables in the procedure

Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	**Cronbach's Alpha based on Standardized Items**	**N of items**
0.765	0.801	10

Procedure

The major objective of the research is to assemble data with reference to students' awareness and sensitivity of themselves, particularly of students' self- introspection on their knowledge of a language, emotional intelligence and their intercultural sensitivity level. Questions were directly asked to the students through survey research and data was collected and analysed through descriptive statistics by using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 20.0, the results of which are illustrated in the tables below. The statistical significance level that was used was <.05 for both independent and dependent sample findings. The data that was collected was grouped and analyzed under the subclass. Quantitative data analysis techniques were used to analyze the questionnaire. Then finally, the scores of language, emotional intelligence and intercultural sensitivity were calculated. Further, descriptive statistics were used to get a picture of students' language (monolingual and multilingual subscales) with emotional intelligence as illustrated in Table 2 and again student's language (monolingual and multilingual subscales) with intercultural sensitivity levels as illustrated in Table 3. Further, to check the hypothesis sample T-test was used with unequal variances as illustrated in Table 4. Although correlation between the two dependent variables was not a part of the study, still it was checked to find out if there exist any statistical correlation between the two using the Pearson's' correlation as illustrated in Table 5.

Results

According to the first hypothesis, if a student is skilled in more than one language, then he or she would have high emotional intelligence than a student who knows only one language. In order to test this hypothesis, students were divided into two groups that are monolinguals and multilinguals. Based on the four subscales of TEIQue (Petrides, 2009) that is in order of well-being, self control, emotionality and sociability, mean scores for these groups were prepared and evaluated. High scores were recorded on each of the subscales that denoted higher sense of emotional intelligence. Table 1 exhibits the mean and standard deviation of emotional intelligence subscale scores for language that is both for monolinguals and multilingual. The results specified that the null hypothesis that was taken is correct.

Table 2

Means and standard deviations for monolinguals and multilinguals' emotional intelligence subscale scores.

	Wellbeing	**Self-control**	**Emotionality**	**Sociability**
Monolingual	M = 4.07	M = 4.07	M = 3.48	M = 4.07
	N = 29	N = 29	N = 29	N = 29
	SD = .961	SD = 1.307	SD = 1.122	SD = 1.534

Multilingual	M = 5.83	M = 5.23	M = 4.79	M = 4.95
	N = 153	N = 153	N = 153	N = 153
	SD = .951	SD = 1.016	SD = 1.207	SD = 1.229
Total	M = 5.55	M = 5.04	M = 4.58	M = 4.81
	N = 182	N = 182	N = 182	N = 182
	SD = .951	SD = 1.016	SD = 1.207	SD = 1.229

On all measures, higher numbers indicate a higher degree of emotional intelligence levels.

According to the second hypothesis, if a student is skilled in more than one language, then he or she would have a high intercultural sensitivity than a student who knows only one language. Based on the five subscales of ISS (Chen & Starosta, 2000) that is in order of Interaction Engagement, Respect for Cultural Differences, Interaction Confidence, Interaction Enjoyment and Interaction Attentiveness, mean scores were prepared and evaluated. High scores were recorded on each of the subscales that denoted higher sense of intercultural sensitivity. Table 3 indicates the means and standard deviation for the intercultural sensitivity subscales scores of monolinguals and multilinguals. The results indicate that the null hypothesis is correct and that if the students are multilingual they will have a higher degree of intercultural sensitivity.

Table 3

Means and standard deviations for monolinguals and multilingual intercultural sensitivity subscale scores.

	Interaction Engagement	Respect for Cultural Differences	Interaction Confidence	Interaction Enjoyment	Interaction Attentiveness
Monolingual	M = 3.41	M = 3.24	M = 3.31	M = 3.21	M = 3.17
	N = 29	N = 29	N = 29	N = 29	N = 29
	SD = .825	SD = .786	SD = .967	SD = .726	SD = .966
Multilingual	M = 4.50	M = 4.23	M = 4.35	M = 4.21	M = 4.27
	N = 153	N = 153	N = 153	N = 153	N = 153
	SD = .619	SD = .730	SD = .755	SD = .758	SD = .805
Total	M = 4.33	M = 4.07	M = 4.18	M = 4.05	M = 4.10
	N = 182	N = 182	N = 182	N = 182	N = 182
	SD = .766	SD = .821	SD = .876	SD = .836	SD = .923

On all measures, higher numbers indicate a higher degree of intercultural sensitivity levels.

In the tables above the mean and standard deviation for monolinguals and multilingual in connection with emotional intelligence subscale scores and intercultural sensitivity subscale scores where the higher numbers indicate a higher degree of the dependent variables.

Table 4

Item Statistics

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Well Being	5.55	1.14	182
Self-control	5.04	1.14	182
Emotionality	4.58	1.28	182
Sociability	4.81	1.31	182
Interaction Engagement	4.33	0.76	182
Respect Cultural Differences	4.07	0.82	182
Interaction Confidence	4.18	0.87	182
Interaction Enjoyment	4.05	0.83	182
Interaction Attentiveness	4.10	0.92	182

Further to check the hypothesis testing, T test was conducted where the means of the two samples assuming unequal variances were compared as illustrated in Table 5.

Table 5

t-Test: Two-Sample Assuming Unequal Variances

	Emotional Intelligence	Intercultural Sensitivity
t-Test: Two-Sample Assuming Unequal Variances	5.5	4.6
Mean	4.99	4.14
Variance	0.79	0.32
Observations	182	182
Hypothesized Mean Difference	0	
df	0.30	

t Stat	10.76
P(T<=t) one-tail	1.96
t Critical one-tail	1.64

Moving further, although the study did not focus on the relation of intercultural sensitivity and emotional intelligence, yet, a series of correlations were also tested between the two major scores that are emotional intelligence and intercultural sensitivity where the following observations are made. The correlations between the two subscales were not always statistically significant and not every subscale was positive with each other. For example, the correlation between wellbeing in emotional intelligent subscale and interaction, engagement in intercultural sensitivity subscale was found negative. So also, emotionality in emotional intelligence subscale and interaction confidence in intercultural sensitivity was found negative. Similarly, sociability in emotional intelligence subscale and interaction confidence in intercultural sensitivity subscale was found negative. The correlation between well being and interactional enjoyment was also found negative and so also the correlation between emotionality and interaction attentiveness and sociability and interaction attentiveness. The statistically significant correlations between the emotional intelligence and cultural sensitivity subscales are presented in the table below. However, it may be assumed in general that had a high level of cultural sensitivity also had a high level of emotional intelligence.

Table 6.

Correlation between emotional intelligence sub scales & intercultural sensitivity sub scales

		Wellbeing	Self-control	Emotionality	Sociability
Interaction Engagement	**Correlation**	**.333**	**.298**	**.219**	**.178**
	Significance (1 tailed)	.000	.000	.001	.008
	df	180	180	180	180
Respect for Cultural Differences	**Correlation**	**.222**	**.014**	**.191**	**.125**
	Significance (1 tailed)	.001	.424	.005	.046
	df	180	180	180	180
Interaction Confidence	**Correlation**	**.405**	**.163**	**.186**	**.078**
	Significance (1 tailed)	.000	.014	.006	.147

	df	180	180	180	180
Interaction Enjoyment	**Correlation**	**.150**	**.153**	**.122**	**.134**
	Significance (1 tailed)	.022	.019	.050	.036
	df	180	180	180	180
Interaction Attentiveness	**Correlation**	**.198**	**.106**	**.236**	**.129**
	Significance (1 tailed)	.004	.078	.001	.041
	df	180	180	180	180

Discussion

If the hypotheses are considered, the results indicate that significant differences were found between students who were monolinguals and multilinguals having high degree of emotional intelligence than intercultural sensitivity levels. Although it can be assumed that emotional intelligence and intercultural sensitivity have positive relationship, it cannot still be generalised that students with higher levels of emotional intelligence have a propensity to have higher levels of intercultural sensitivity. Hence, the correlation between the two is significantly weak. At the other hand, the findings of this study do not correspond with the findings of preceding studies that did not establish a statistically significant relationship of emotional intelligence between monolinguals and multilinguals, "neither the relationship of intercultural sensitivity between monolinguals and multilingulas proved statistically significant, along with a statistically significant positive correlation between intercultural sensitivity subscales and emotional intelligence subscales" (Root, 2019, p.1). Studies further reveal that "L2 students might well strive to preserve their own cultural identities" (Phan and Baurain, 2011, p. 55) that may cause hindrances in intercultural communication. Although self confidence becomes a primary factor that "involves positive perceptions of one's competence and control over achievement" (Pekrun, Muis, Frenzel, & Goetz, 2018, p. 137) students may still lack confidence to approach other students from other cultures. Evaluating one's aptitude to distinguish others' emotional states connected to an "individual's struggles to understand what are going on in an intercultural communication process" (Erdem, Bağci, & Koçyiğit, 2019, p. 165-166) is where the role of emotionality appears distinctive in interaction attentiveness. This ability seemed weak among the students. It was also found that sociability and interaction confidence also did not correlate to each other. However, Rhodes argues that "without initiating a conversation, nothing else can happen and that this step is the most important, and usually the most difficult step" (Rhodes, 2017, p. 39).

The present study had quite a few flaws that are assumed to have created an impact on the results. The questionnaire was too long and lacked a question on the frequency of travelling by the participants as travel provides a higher platform to expose oneself to diverse cultures.

Subsequently, travelling could have been another variable for intercultural sensitivity that was not required for this study. Moreover, all the participants were Indians apparently speaking Hindi the national language and Odiya also being the main language. More participants from various parts of the country could have resulted in yet different results. Resulting in globalization, factors like language knowledge, emotional intelligence and intercultural sensitivity have managed to become complementary traits for university students to posses. This study can have future scope of further studies like correlating all the three variables among graduates from one discipline or preferably looked at as a trait for employability assessment. This would potentially help the students not only develop a thorough personality but also a sustainable factor to work in a diverse workspace.

5. Conclusion

In this paper, we have argued that multilingual university students have higher emotional intelligence than monolinguals in comparison to intercultural sensitivity. The correlation between emotional intelligence and intercultural sensitivity was found statistically weak, although emotional intelligence dimensions made positive correlation with the dimensions of intercultural sensitivity, however, that was not enough to create a statistically significant and positive correlation between the two. That suggests that neither emotional intelligence impacts intercultural sensitivity nor intercultural sensitivity impacts emotional intelligence. University students are required to prepare themselves to work in various domains where they need to connect with people amidst numerous languages and with different emotional understanding. As a critical ability, emotional intelligence helps develops better interpersonal communication. As language is one of the core aspects of communication, multilingual students will be able to influence communication with clarity and develop connection through understanding others' point of view and building trust. This study would further help develop emotional intelligence among students by accepting it as a prime focus in university curriculum, imparting training and development programs during academia and encouraging continuous self- assessment among the students

Reference

1. Aliasin, S. H., & Abbasi, S. (2020). The Relationship between Iranian EFL Learners' Emotional Intelligence and Metacognitive Reading Strategies Use. Journal of Language and Education, 6 (2), 31-43. https://doi.org/10.17323/ jle.2020.9730
2. Angelone, E., Ehrensberger-Dow, M., & Massey, G. (2019). The Bloomsbury Companion to Language Industry Studies. London: Bloomsbury.
3. Chen, G. (1990). Intercultural communication competence: Some perspectives of research. Howard Journal of Communications, 2(3), 243-261. doi:10.1080/10646179009359718
4. Chen, G.M., & Starosta, W. J. (2000). The Development and Validation of the Intercultural Sensitivity Scale. Human Communication, 3, 1–15.
5. Chomsky, N. (1975). Reflections on Language. New York: Pantheon.
6. Dalton, M., Hoyle, D. G., & Watts, M. W. (2010). Human relations. Australia: South-Western Cengage Learning.

7. Dewaele, J. M. (2010). Emotions in Multiple Languages. Basingstoke: Palgrave Macmillan

8. Dios Martínez Agudo Juan de. (2018). Emotions in second language teaching: theory, research and teacher education. Cham: Springer.

9. Dodigovic, M. (2018). Artificial Intelligence in Second Language Learning: Raising Error Awareness. Bristol: Multilingual Matters.

10. Donnelly, C. (1994). Linguistics for Writers. Albany: State Univ. of New York Press.

11. Dwyer, J., & Hopwood, N. (2020). The Business Communication Handbook. South Melbourne, Victoria: Cengage Learning Australia.

12. Ehrman, M. E. (1996). Understanding Second Language Learning Difficulties. California: Sage Publications.

13. Ellis, E. M. (2008). Defining and Investigating Monolingualism. Sociolinguistic Studies, 2(3), 311-330. doi:10.1558/sols.v2i3.311

14. Erdem, C., Bağci H, & Koçyiğit M. (2019). 21St Century Skills and Education. Newcastle upon Tyne, UK: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

15. Eyraud, K. Giles, G. Koenig, S and Stoller, F. (2000), The Word Wall Approach Pormoting L2 Vocabulary Learning. Canada: Ernst Haas/Stone

16. Giesbrecht, R. (2009). The Sapir-Whorf Hypothesis. London: GRIN Verlag.

17. Goleman, D. (2010). Emotional intelligence: why it can matter more than IQ. London: Bloomsbury

18. González Josué M. (2008). Encyclopedia of Bilingual Education. Thousand Oaks (Calif.): Sage

19. Guntersdorfer, I., & Golubeva, I. (2018). Emotional Intelligence and Intercultural Competence: Theoretical Questions and Pedagogical Possibilities. Intercultural Communication Education, 1(2), 54–63. doi: 10.29140/ice.v1n2.60

20. Hardan, A. A. (2013). Language Learning Strategies: A General Overview. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 106, 1712-1726. doi:10.1016/j.sbspro.2013.12.194

21. Hemmeter, M., & Kaiser, A. (1990). Environmental Influences on Children's Language: A Model and Case Study. Education and Treatment of Children, 13(4), 331-346. Retrieved June 25, 2020, From Www.Jstor.Org/Stable/42899177

22. Hughes, W., & Lavery, J. (2004). Critical Thinking: An Introduction to the Basic Skills. Peterborough, Ont.: Broadview Press.

23. Huyssteen, W. V. (2006). Alone in the world? : Human Uniqueness in Science and Theology. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

24. Jansen, D. E., & Riemer, M. J. (2002). Emotional Intelligence and Intercultural Competence: Theoretical Questions and Pedagogical Possibilities. 6th Baltic Region Seminar on Engineering Education, 53–58.

25. Kramsch, C. J., & Widdowson, H. G. (2011). Language and culture. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

26. Kramsch, C. J., &. Widdowson, H. G. (2011). Language and culture. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

27. Krashen, S. D. (1987). Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition. New York, London, Toronto: Prentice-Hall Intern.

28. López, M. M. (2011). The motivational properties of emotions in Foreign Language Learning*. Colombian Applied Linguistics Journal, 13(2), 43. doi:10.14483/22487085.3764

29. Morilla-García, C. (2017). The Role of Emotional Intelligence in Bilingual Education: A Study on the Improvement of the Oral Language Skill. Multidisciplinary Journal of Educational Research, 7(1), 27. doi: 10.17583/remie.2017.1840

30. Ndimele, O.-mekuri, & Emenanjọ, E. N. (2019). In the linguistic paradise: a festschrift for E. Nolue Emenanjo. Port Harcourt: M et J Grand Orbit Communications Ltd.

31. Nunez, C. (2018). Intercultural Sensitivity: From Denial to Intercultural Competence. Assen: Koninklijke Van Gorcum.

32. Ouazzi, K.(2016). The Effects of CLIL Education on the Subject Matter (Mathematics) and the Target Language (English). Latin American Journal of Content and Language Integrated learning, 9(1), 110-137.

33. Ożańska-Ponikwia, K. (2018). Personality and Emotional Intelligence in Second Language Learning. Newcastle upon Tyne: Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

34. Pekrun, R., Muis, K. R., Frenzel, A. C., & Goetz, T. (2018). Emotions at School. New York: Routledge.

35. Petrides, K. V. (2009). Psychometric Properties of the Trait Emotional Intelligence Questionnaire (TEIQue). Assessing Emotional Intelligence the Springer Series on Human Exceptionality, 85–101. doi: 10.1007/978-0-387-88370-0_5.

36. Phan, L. H., & Baurain, B. (2011). Voices, identities, negotiations, and conflicts: writing academic English across cultures. London: Emerald Group Publishing Limited.

37. Piller, I. (2018). Intercultural communication: A Critical Introduction. Edinburgh: EUP.

38. Pishghadam, R. (2009). A Study on the Relationship between Emotional Intelligence and Foreign Language Achievement. Electronic Journal of Foreign Language Teaching ,6(1), 31–41.

39. Pollock, D. C., Reken, R. E. V., & Pollock, M. V. (2017). Third Culture Kids: The Experience of Growing Up Among Worlds: The original, classic book on TCKs. UK: Nicholas Brealey Publishing.

40. Rhodes, M. (2017). How to Talk To Absolutely Anyone: Confident Communication for Work, Life and Relationships. Chichester, West Sussex, United Kingdom: Capstone, a Wiley brand.

41. Romanowski, P., & Bandura, E. (2019). Intercultural foreign language teaching and learning in higher education contexts. Hershey: IGI Global.

42. Root, S. (2019). The Relationship between Language, Emotional Intelligence, and Cultural Sensitivity (Honors Theses). The Dominican University of California: 55, https://scholar.dominican.edu/honors-theses/55

43. Samovar, L. A., Porter, R. E., & McDaniel, E. R. (2009). Intercultural Communication: A Reader. Boston: Wadsworth Cengage Learning.

44. Steventon, G., Cureton, D., & Clouder, D. L. (2016). Student Attainment in Higher Education: Issues, Controversies and Debates. London: Routledge.

45. Stough, C., Saklofske, D. H., & Parker, J. D. A. (2010). Assessing Emotional Intelligence Theory, Research, and Applications. New York: Springer.

46. Taheri, L., & Jadidi, E. (2016). The Relationship between Emotional Intelligence and Learning Strategies among Iranian EFL Learners. Theory and Practice in Language Studies, 6(5), 952. doi:10.17507/tpls.0605.06

47. Wu, J.-F. (2015). Examining Chen and Starostas Model of Intercultural Sensitivity in the Taiwanese Cultural Context. International Journal of Modern Education and Computer Science, 7(6), 1–8. doi: 10.5815/ijmecs.2015.06.01

48. Zafari, M., & Biria, R. (2014). The Relationship between Emotional Intelligence and Language Learning Strategy Use. Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences, 98, 1966–1974. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.03.630

49. Zarafshan, M. & Ardeshiri, M (2012). Relationship between Emotional Intelligence, Language Learning Strategies and English Proficiency among Iranian EFL University Students, Journal of Educational and Instructional Studies in The World, 2 (3), 5-14.

50. Zilber, E. (2009). Third culture kids: the Children of Educators in International Schools. Woodbridge: John Catt Educational.