

Bridging Minds and Language: Social Intelligence and Sociolinguistic Competences Among EFL Learners

Abeer Al-Ghazo^{1*}, Ibrahim Fathi Huwari²

¹Department of English Language and Literature, Ajloun National University, Ajloun, Jordan, ²Department of English, University of Petra, Amman, Jordan. *Corresponding Author's Email: fares.abeer@yahoo.com

Abstract

Social intelligence plays an essential role in bridging the gap between practical language usage and linguistic knowledge. Therefore, the main aim of this paper is to investigate the main role of social intelligence in developing sociolinguistic competence among EFL learners. This study adopted a quantitative correlational research design to examine the relationship between social intelligence and sociolinguistic competence among EFL learners. The construct validity of both the Social Intelligence Scale and the Sociolinguistic Competence Test was verified through factor analysis, confirming their basic dimensions and the suitability of their respective constructs. The reliability analysis showed satisfactory internal consistency for both instruments, with Cronbach's alpha coefficients of 0.79 for the Social Intelligence Scale and 0.87 for the Sociolinguistic Competence Test, indicating that both instruments demonstrated a satisfactory level of internal consistency, reliability and long-term stability. A purposive sample of sixty male and female EFL students participated in the study. Social Intelligence Scale and Sociolinguistic Competence test were used to obtain the data needed to achieve the objectives of the study. The results of this study highlight the major role of social intelligence in enhancing the sociolinguistic competence of EFL learners. The findings revealed a statistically significant positive relationship between social intelligence and sociolinguistic competence among Jordanian EFL learners, indicating that students with higher social intelligence are likely to have stronger sociolinguistic communication skills.

Keywords: EFL Learners, Language, Social Intelligence, Sociolinguistics Competences.

Introduction

Generating qualified and competitive EFL learners with intercultural awareness and international perspectives requires communicative competence in EFL classes. Furthermore, competence strongly influences the link between symbols, concepts and referents across languages. Bilinguals' mental lexicons of the two languages are thought to be stored in distinct mental folders (1). This allows them to succeed in making sense of English texts and mastering the English language. The focus of teaching foreign languages has shifted from emphasizing pronunciation, grammar, vocabulary and reading to communicative proficiency (2). Learners can develop their communicative competence through: "Knowing how to use language for a range of different purposes and functions, knowing how to vary our use of language according to the setting and the participants, knowing how to produce and understand different types of texts and Knowing how to maintain communication despite having limitations in one's language knowledge" (3). The

first comprehensive model of communicative competence was introduced by Canale and Swain. It included grammatical, sociolinguistic, strategic and later discourse competence. The language system comprises discourse competence and grammatical competence, while sociolinguistic competence and strategic competence represent the functional characteristics of language (4). Sociolinguistic competence is defined as the ability to comprehend and regulate interpersonal relationships. Using language, that is appropriate for the social context, including tone, courtesy and cultural norms, is a component of sociolinguistic competence (5, 6). Although learners are having high grammatical skills, they frequently suffer pragmatic failure when they lack cultural understanding (7, 8). According to the intended Speech acts such as requests, apologies, compliments, refusals and expressions of agreement or disagreement constitute essential components of sociolinguistic competence (9). Depending on the situation, EFL learners must

This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution CC BY license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>), which permits unrestricted reuse, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

(Received 23rd March 2026; Accepted 23rd June 2026; Published 20th July 2026)

recognize and select the appropriate speech act or communicative function. In addition, it is crucial for EFL students to know the intended meaning behind the utterance (10). Hence, the present study endeavors to examine the significance of social intelligence in the enhancement of sociolinguistic competence among individuals acquiring English as a Foreign Language (EFL). Social intelligence is regarded as a crucial element that is expected to affect the manner in which students interact with their academic environment and the larger context of their surroundings. The establishment of social connections appears to be fundamental to the development of learners' interpersonal skills and linguistic proficiency.

Social intelligence deals with the ability to comprehend individual's one encounters (11). Social intelligence is described as the capacity to engage with people successfully (12). SI is characterized by a blend of social and self-awareness, ingrained social attitudes and beliefs and the capacity to manage complex social shifts (13). Social intelligence refers to the ability to recognize differences among individuals, particularly in terms of their moods, attitudes, motivation and intentions (14). Consequently, it provides the ability to communicate, comprehend and handle various situations effectively. It includes perceiving and distinguishing the mood, intentions, motives and feelings of others, as well as responding efficiently to signs of interaction between individuals (15).

University students with social intelligence can perform appropriately and politely in everyday social settings. Their abilities to see and comprehend the actions and behaviors of others, as well as to share in their happiness or sorrow, make them people who are loved and accepted by others. They also have a spirit of humor and fun, which makes them successful and influential in their dealings with others.

Three SI models are available to address this issue and provide additional insights into this concept in L2 instruction. SI is viewed as the ability to recognize, understand, control and use emotions to facilitate one's thoughts (16). In an attempt to encompass other elements and facets, a novel conceptual framework for Social Intelligence (SI) and Emotional Intelligence (EQ) is presented, conceptualizing SI as a multidimensional construct shaped by an array of competencies and

capabilities that significantly affect an individual's efficacy (17).

The most recent model delineates five interconnected emotional and social competencies, abilities and facilitators: interpersonal skills, decision-making, self-expression, self-participation and stress management, that are posited to exert a substantial influence on intelligent behavior (18, 19).

Recent researches support the fact that EFL students that possess higher social intelligence, which describe the ability to understand and manage social interactions, are better at identifying language forms that are appropriate in various social contexts, including cultural norms, variations in register and politeness conventions. Thus, the debate over the concept of social intelligence has garnered the interest of numerous scholars and their investigations have encompassed various social, behavioral, cognitive and linguistic dimensions of it (20, 21).

Despite the existence of numerous empirical investigations that have explored the correlation between various forms of intelligence and an array of additional variables, including academic achievement, social responsibility and self-concept, there remains a paucity of scholarly research focusing specifically on the interplay between social intelligence and sociolinguistic competence within English as Foreign Language (EFL) educational environments. The study, which aimed to assess the linguistic, rhetorical and literary competencies of English language studies students, found statistically significant differences and a statistically significant relationship between social, rhetorical and literary linguistic competencies according to nationality and years of study of English (22). The interplay between cultural and social intelligence and their relationship with students' competencies in translating texts of cultural and social significance was investigated. The study revealed a noteworthy correlation between the proficiency of student translators in rendering cultural and social texts and their cultural and social intelligences, as well as the associated subscales (23). It was explored how explicit instruction contributes to enhancing the social language competence of second language learners. It places a strong emphasis on instructor discussion, contextualized input and interactive exercises to help students improve their use of

speech actions and politeness techniques. The findings showed that context-rich contact encourages the natural application of sociolinguistic norms, instructor modeling (24). Many researchers examined how the emotional and social intelligence of English language teachers affected the classroom environment and the sociolinguistic competence development for students. The results revealed that teachers with high SI foster better peer interaction; SI training can indirectly boost students' sociolinguistic competence and classroom emotional climate impacts pragmatic language use (25).

The relationship between social intelligence and Iranian EFL students' willingness to communicate (WTC) in English was examined through a quantitative survey design. The findings show a significant positive association, indicating that willingness to communicate is directly supported by increasing SI (26). A study was also carried out on the effectiveness of teachers' teaching of sociolinguistic competence on Egyptian EFL students. The research outcomes indicate that the application of sociolinguistic competence teaching strategies significantly enhances linguistic proficiency, as perceived by university EFL students (27).

Therefore, the main objective of this study was to investigate the role of social intelligence in enhancing sociolinguistic competence among learners of English as a Foreign Language (EFL). In other words, it seeks to examine the link between social intelligence and sociolinguistic competence in EFL classrooms. Such an investigation may provide valuable insights into language teaching strategies, curriculum design and the development of learners' communicative competence.

The current study seeks to provide answers to the following research questions:

- a) To what extent do EFL students possess social intelligence, as measured by the Social Intelligence Scale (SIS)?
- b) What is the level of sociolinguistic competence among EFL students according to the Sociolinguistic Competence Checklist?
- c) Is there a statistically significant relationship between social intelligence and sociolinguistic competence among EFL students?

Statement of the Problem

EFL students frequently struggle to grasp and use the language appropriately for the circumstance and context because they lack sociolinguistic competence in the target language. One of the primary causes is a lack of exposure to using language in a sociolinguistic suitable manner. Since sociolinguistic competence falls under communicative competence, having social intelligence and communicative competence allows EFL learners to communicate effectively with others, focusing not only on accuracy but also on relevance (28, 29). Although a considerable body of research has addressed numerous dimensions of social Intelligence, including behavioral, cognitive and linguistic characteristics and examined its correlation with academic performance and factors such as creativity, gender, age and personal cultural contexts (30-32), few studies have explored the significance of social intelligence in enhancing sociolinguistic competencies among foreign language learners.

Methodology

Research Design

This study is quantitative because the means and standard deviations of students' answers were computed to achieve the study goal. The results are discussed to measure students' social intelligence and their Sociolinguistic competence through implementing the social intelligence scale and appropriateness test.

Participants of the Study

Sixty ANU EFL students (28 male and 32 female) who studied at Ajloun National University (approximate GPS coordinates 32.396548N, 35.822968 E) and whose native language was Arabic. For the academic year 2026, they were specifically selected from the English Language and Literature Department, Faculty of Arts, to participate in collecting the needed data. The participants were in their second and third academic years and were enrolled in the course Conversation (1), each with 30 pupils. Before data collection, informed consent was obtained from all participants. Participants were informed of the study's purpose and assured that their participation was voluntary and that their responses would remain confidential and used solely for research purposes. Furthermore, formal

approval to conduct the study was obtained from the relevant department at ANU.

Instruments

To obtain the information needed to achieve the purpose of the study, the researcher used these two instruments (Parts A and B), discussed in Appendix A.

Social Intelligence Scale (SIS)

To measure students' ability to understand and manage social interactions, the Social Intelligence Scale was adapted (33). It consists of twenty-one items distributed across three main dimensions: social information processing, social skills and social awareness. These dimensions are measured using a five-point Likert scale ranging from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree." The SIS scale has been widely used in educational and psychological research due to its high reliability and validity in assessing individuals' abilities to interpret social cues and communicate efficiently and effectively in various social contexts.

Sociolinguistic Competence Test

To measure the ability to use language appropriately in various social and cultural contexts, a Sociolinguistic Appropriateness Test was used (34). The instrument assessed participants' ability to choose appropriate language based on various social factors. It included situational tasks in which EFL learners were asked to provide appropriate responses in everyday communication situations, demonstrating their attitudes and awareness of socially and culturally appropriate language use.

Validity and Reliability of the Instruments

Validity

To ensure the validity of the instruments, they underwent review by a committee of university professors specializing in applied linguistics, education and measurement and evaluation. The reviewers carefully examined the suitability of the instruments for the study's purposes and provided numerous valuable comments and suggestions. Their feedback was taken into account and the necessary modifications were made accordingly. The Social Intelligence Scale has demonstrated good construct validity, confirmed through factor analysis, which revealed three underlying

dimensions: social information processing, social skills and awareness. The validity of the Sociolinguistic Competence test items was also verified in terms of linguistic concept and correctness of both form and content. A factor analysis which categorizes the test items into pertinent sociolinguistic appropriateness components, provided additional evidence for construct validity

Reliability

To examine the clarity and reliability of the research instrument, the internal consistency of respondents' answers in the pilot study was tested using Cronbach's alpha coefficient for all the sections of the Social Intelligence Scale as well as the Sociolinguistic Competence test. A pilot study was conducted to examine the clarity and reliability of the research instrument. The pilot group consisted of 40 undergraduate students from the English as a Foreign Language Department, who did not participate in the main study. Because these students belonged to the same academic department and had similar educational and linguistic backgrounds to the target participants, they were deemed suitable for the pilot phase. During this phase, the students provided feedback on the clarity, wording and suitability of the test items. Their feedback helped identify some aspects requiring minor revision. The Cronbach's Alpha coefficient, for the items in the Social Intelligence Scale was 0.79 which means that there was an internal consistency in the data. Furthermore, the Sociolinguistic Competence Test yielded a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of 0.87, indicating that the instrument demonstrated a satisfactory level of internal consistency, reliability and long-term stability.

Results and Discussion

Findings Related to the First Research Question

The first question of the study was, to what extent do EFL students possess social intelligence as measured by the Social Intelligence Scale (SIS)? This can be answered using the Social Intelligence Scale (SIS). The means and standard deviations of students' answers were computed, as presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Means and Standard Deviations of EFL Students' Social Intelligence as Measured by the Social Intelligence Scale (SIS)

Items	Mean	Standard Deviation	Agreement Degree
I understand how my actions affect other people.	4.14	1.06	High
I can predict how people will react in various situations.	4.24	0.89	High
I find it easy to talk to new people.	4.43	0.93	High
I am aware of the social rules in different settings.	4.24	0.94	High
I can tell when someone is uncomfortable in a conversation.	3.90	1.14	High
I am good at solving problems between people.	4.24	0.89	High
I can easily adapt my behavior to suit different social situations.	4.00	1.14	High
I notice small details in people's behavior that others might miss.	3.95	1.07	High
I can usually sense when someone wants to change the topic.	4.24	0.94	High
I am comfortable starting a conversation with strangers.	4.10	1.09	High
I can explain things in a way that makes sense to different people.	4.00	1.22	High
I know when to speak and when to listen in a conversation.	4.43	0.93	High
I find it easy to make new friends.	1.86	.55	Low
I can guess how someone feels even without them saying it.	4.10	1.14	High
I am confident in group discussions.	3.90	0.89	High
I can notice changes in someone's mood during a conversation.	3.25	0.63	Moderate
I am aware of the hidden meanings behind people's words.	4.35	0.58	High
I adjust my tone depending on the person I'm speaking to.	1.99	0.65	Low
I can stay calm when dealing with difficult people.	3.25	0.63	Moderate
I am able to convince others during discussions.	2.73	0.55	Moderate
I can work well with people from different backgrounds.	3.25	0.63	Moderate
Total	3.742381	0.222676	High

The mean score of the 60 EFL students on the Social Intelligence Scale (SIS) was 3.74 (SD = 0.22267). The data indicate that these EFL students possess a higher degree expected level of social intelligence on the SIS. This means that students with social intelligence can build good relationships, deal with people effectively, confront them and influence them based on appropriate behavior in social settings through their understanding of general etiquette, social norms and traditions, beliefs and theories. They can also differentiate between the various indicators that serve as guides to social relations, as well as perceive and differentiate the moods of others, their intentions, motives and feelings. Additionally, it aids in self-control, fostering positive relationships with others, overcoming life's challenges and social adaptation, which is the fundamental component for making the best use of the objectives and resources society sets for its members. This leads to harmony and concord between individuals, which in turn leads to success in all spheres of society. These actions show that the person has social intelligence, which helps

integrate him/her successfully into the community. As a result, his outgoing and upbeat nature is evident in all facets of life.

These findings align with a larger body of research that presents SI as an essential element of effective communication and interpersonal functioning. The SIS has been widely used to evaluate social intelligence (SI), which was defined as the capacity to comprehend and act upon social information. Many academics have argued that higher SI promotes more fluid interactional routines, turn-taking and sensitivity to social norms in language learning and education, with applications in applied linguistics that link social/pragmatic skills with classroom participation and communication willingness. A researcher, who investigated the relationship between social intelligence of teaching staff at Princess Rahma University College and student's interaction with educational topic, found there was a strong positive correlation between teaching staff member social intelligence and students' interaction with scientific subject (35).

Table 2: One-sample Statistics - Sociolinguistic Competence

Sociolinguistic	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t-test	F
Competence Score	60	88.75	10.42	2.78	59

Note: N- Number of Participants, Mean - Mean Score, Std. Deviation - Standard Deviation-test - t-test Value, F - F-statistic Value (ANOVA).

Findings Related to the Second Research Question

The second question was: What is the level of sociolinguistic competence among EFL students according to the Sociolinguistic Appropriateness Test? This can be answered using Sociolinguistic Appropriateness Test. The means, standard deviation, test Value and F-statistic Value of students' answers were computed, as presented in Table 2.

The second question aimed to investigate the level of sociolinguistic competence among EFL students, as measured by the Sociolinguistic Appropriateness Test. The descriptive results show that the mean score of the students was 88.75 (SD = 10.42) out of the test value benchmark of 85. This suggests that the participants' overall sociolinguistic competence was relatively high. These results indicated that the EFL participants demonstrated a level of sociolinguistic competence that exceeded the expected benchmark.

Moreover, the statistical findings confirm that the level of participants' sociolinguistic proficiency was meaningfully above the expected criterion level. This indicates that the learners were able to acquire not only linguistic forms but also the pragmatic and cultural dimensions of English use. Such results are consistent with some previous studies indicating that incorporating sociolinguistic awareness into EFL instruction enhances learners' overall communicative effectiveness.

The present results are consistent with earlier research highlighting the crucial role of sociolinguistic competence in achieving effective communication. Within a model of communicative competence, sociolinguistic competence is identified as a core component, encompassing an understanding of social conventions, cultural appropriateness and sensitivity to contextual changes. The relatively high mean score obtained in this study shows that the participants developed not just grammatical knowledge but also the ability to use language appropriately across a range of communicative situations (4).

Previous studies have indicated similar findings, confirming that role-playing activities, explicit teaching methods and realistic communicative tasks effectively contribute to the development of sociolinguistic competence. Furthermore, integrating sociolinguistic competence strategies into the context of teaching and learning English as a foreign language significantly improves learners' linguistic proficiency and their awareness of sociolinguistic diversity, according to university-level English as a foreign language student (27).

Findings Related to the Third Research Question

The third question was: Is there any statistically significant relationship between social intelligence and sociolinguistic competence among EFL students? To answer this question, Pearson's correlation was measured.

Table 3: Correlation Coefficients between Social Intelligence and Sociolinguistic Competence Among EFL Students

Social Intelligence	Lingus Skill		
Social Intelligence	Pearson	1	0.68
Sig.			
N	60	60	
Sociolinguistic Competence	Pearson	.68 **	1
N	60	60	

Note: N refers to the sample size (N = 60). Sig. refers to the significance value (p-value). ** p < 0.01 (2-tailed test).

Table 3 shows a strong positive relationship between social intelligence and sociolinguistic competence among EFL students. The significance value was $p = 0.000$ ($p < 0.01$) and the Pearson correlation coefficient was $r = 0.68$.

The results show that learners' sociolinguistic competence increases alongside their level of social intelligence. The strength of the correlation confirms the assumption that these two variables are closely related within the context of EFL

learning, which reflects a statistically significant and meaningful association. Accordingly, EFL learners who show higher levels of social intelligence tend to demonstrate stronger sociolinguistic competence (14). This competence involves the appropriate use of language across diverse social and cultural contexts. Such a result is theoretically sound, as both constructs or dimensions rely on an awareness of social cues and the ability to respond appropriately to contextual demands.

The present findings align with previous studies highlighting the importance of social intelligence in language learning and communication. For instance, a study investigating the relationship between social intelligence and EFL students' willingness to communicate in Iran, reported a significant positive association between the two variables (26). Similarly, another study indicated that SI is crucial for effective communication, as it enables individuals to build the relationships and anticipate the behavior of other people (25).

It was showed that the sociolinguistic dimension of communicative competence closely overlaps with social intelligence, which relates to successful interaction, empathy and relationship developing (6). In the context of EFL, it was also emphasized that students' awareness of social factors is closely linked to pragmatic success in the second language. The results of the current study support these views, as they provide empirical evidence of a strong correlation between students' social intelligence and their ability to use language appropriately in diverse social and cultural contexts. Furthermore, it was emphasized that classroom activities and practices such as role-plays, interactive tasks and cooperative learning activities can foster learners' pragmatic and sociolinguistic development effectively and efficiently. Through these instructional approaches, enhancing students' social intelligence may indirectly strengthen their sociolinguistic competence. Overall, the results of the present study clearly indicate a significant relationship between social intelligence and sociolinguistic competence among EFL learners. Therefore, developing students' social intelligence should be viewed as a key element in effective language teaching. Rather than being a fixed or innate trait, social intelligence can be developed gradually

through structured experiences, reflective practice and well-designed educational interventions (27).

Conclusion

The results of the present study highlight the major role of social intelligence in enhancing the sociolinguistic competence of EFL learners. They indicate that the participants possess a high level of social intelligence and Sociolinguistic Competence as assessed by the Social Intelligence Scale (SIS) and the Sociolinguistic Competence test. Additionally, the analysis revealed a statistically significant correlation between sociolinguistic competence and social intelligence, indicating that students with higher social intelligence are likely to have stronger sociolinguistic communication abilities.

Based on these findings, the study concluded that enhancing social intelligence can meaningfully support the development of sociolinguistic competence in English as a foreign language (EFL) teaching context. The results highlight the importance of integrating social and emotional learning strategies into language teaching context. This enables teachers to create a classroom environment that fosters and promotes both social awareness and effective language use, which in turn supports the overall communicative development of learners.

Based on the findings of this study, it is recommended that English as Foreign Language (EFL) departments are encouraged to incorporate structured and guided classroom activities designed to enhance and foster learners' social intelligence. These kinds of activities may include collaborative tasks, role-plays, critical thinking discussions and problem-solving exercises that promote social awareness and cooperation. It is also recommended to implement specialized training programs to develop and raise learners' sociolinguistic awareness. These programs should focus on developing learners' ability to choose socially and culturally appropriate forms of language in diverse contexts. Future research should include larger and more diverse samples from different universities and educational contexts to enhance the generalizability of the findings. It also encourages the use of mixed or qualitative approaches, such as interviews, observations and case studies, to gain a deeper

understanding of social intelligence and sociolinguistic competence among learners.

Limitations of the Study

This study is subject to several limitations that should be considered when interpreting its results. First, the research was conducted using a relatively small sample of sixty EFL students, selected from only two conversation courses within the Department of English Language and Literature. Consequently, the findings may not be fully generalizable to EFL learners in academic departments, universities, or other educational institutions, which could limit the applicability of the results more broadly. Furthermore, the study relied primarily on quantitative instruments, specifically the Social Intelligence Scale and the SI Test. While these instruments provided measurable and statistically analyzable data, they may not fully reflect the students' actual social interactions or their real-life sociolinguistic performance in real-world communicative contexts.

Abbreviations

ANU: Ajloun National University, EFL: English as a Foreign Language, SI: Social Intelligence, SIS: Social Intelligence Scale.

Author Contributions

All the authors are equally contributed.

Acknowledgement

The author would like to express their sincere gratitude to the participating university English language students for their time and valuable contributions to this study. Appreciation is also extended to the university department of English Language and Literature for their support in facilitating classroom access and its' cooperation to the successful implementation and completion of the study.

Conflict of Interest

The author declares that there are no conflicts of interests regarding the publication of this paper.

Data Availability

The data used in this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

Declaration of Artificial Intelligence (AI) Assistance

The author used artificial intelligence-assisted language tools solely for linguistic editing and grammatical improvement. All scientific content, analysis, interpretations and conclusions were prepared and reviewed by the authors. The authors take full responsibility for the content's originality, interpretation and accuracy.

Ethics Approval

The Ethical Committee of the Ajloun National University, Jordan has granted approval for this study on 8 December 2025.

Funding

This study received no specific financial support.

References

- Bal NG, Savaş P. Intercultural language teaching and learning: Teachers' perspectives and practices. *Participatory Educational Research*. 2022;9(6):268-285.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.17275/per.22.139.9.6>
- Crystal D. *English as a global language*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2003. ISBN: 9780521530323.
https://culturaldiplomacy.org/academy/pdf/research/books/nation_branding/English_As_A_Global_Language_-_David_Crystal.pdf
- Richards JC, Rodgers TS. *Approaches and methods in language teaching*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2001. ISBN: 9780521008433.
<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511667305>
- Canale M, Swain M. Theoretical bases of communicative approaches to second language teaching and testing. *Appl Linguist*. 1980;1(1):1-47.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/applin/1.1.1>
- Echavez CJ. Shapeshifting in social spaces: Sociolinguistic competence of multilingual learners. *Kajian Linguistik Dan Sastra*. 2024;9(2):202-18.
<https://doi.org/10.23917/kl.v9i2.6606>
- Goleman D. *Social intelligence: The new science of human relationships*. New York: Bantam; 2012.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/jpoc.20099>
- Kasper G. Interlanguage pragmatics. In: Fried M, Östman J, Verschueren J (ed.) *Variation and Change: Pragmatic perspectives*. John Benjamins Publishing Company; 2010. p.141-154.
<https://doi.org/10.1075/hoph.6.11kas>
- Kasper G, Blum-Kulka S. *Interlanguage pragmatics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press; 1993.
<https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780195066029.001.0001>
- Searle J. *Speech Acts: An Essay in the Philosophy of Language*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 1969. ISBN: 9780521096263.

- <https://www.cambridge.org/gs/universitypress/subjects/philosophy/philosophy-mind-and-language/speech-acts-essay-philosophy-language>
10. Brown LT, Anthony RG. Continuing the search for social intelligence. *Pers Individ Dif*. 1990;11(5):463-70.
[https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869\(90\)90059-Z](https://doi.org/10.1016/0191-8869(90)90059-Z)
 11. Sternberg RJ, Kaufman SB, editors. *The Cambridge handbook of intelligence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press; 2011. ISBN: 9780521739115
 12. Ford ME, Tisak MS. A further search for social intelligence. *Journal of Educational Psychology*. 1983;75(2):196-206.
<https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-0663.75.2.196>
 13. Ganaie MY, Mudasir H. A study of social intelligence & academic achievement of college students of district Srinagar, J&K, India. *Journal of American Science*. 2015;11(3):23-7.
https://www.jofamericanscience.org/journals/amsci/am110315/004_28107am110315_23_27.pdf
 14. Karl A. *Social Intelligence: The new science of success*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass. 2006.
https://books.google.co.in/books?hl=en&lr=&id=c60FEQAAQBAJ&oi=fnd&pg=PR7&dq=+Social+intelligence:+The+new+science+of+success.+Cairo:+Arab+Company+for+Scientific+Media&ots=mALRtdyCi&sig=waikdXxOFLEjpPBCQZlu4vRz8yo&redir_esc=y#v=onepage&q&f=false
 15. Abdelkader O, Aissa M. The importance of social intelligence among university students. *Int J Res Innov Soc Sci*. 2025;9(3):945-954.
doi:10.47772/IJRISS.2025.90300075.
 16. Salovey P, Mayer JD. Emotional intelligence. *Imagin Cogn Pers*. 1990;9(3):185-211.
<https://doi.org/10.2190/DUGG-P24E-52WK-6CDG>
 17. Goleman D. What makes a leader? *Harv Bus Rev*. 1998;76(6):93-102.
<https://srcus.org/wp-content/uploads/What-Makes-A-Leader-Goleman-Article-pages-1-5.pdf>
 18. Bar-On R. *BarOn emotional quotient inventory*. New York: Multi-health systems; 1997.
<https://cjwtolfe.com/EQI%20Development%20Report.pdf>
 19. Bar-On R. The Bar-On model of emotional-social intelligence (ESI). *Psicothema*. 2006;13:13-25.
<https://www.psicothema.com/pdf/3271.pdf>
 20. Ahmad AOA, Mohammed TAS. Social intelligence and its relation to the performance of students in foreign language skills: a study of Yemeni students at the Department of English, Taiz University, Turba Branch. *Al-Ustath J Hum Soc Sci*. 2020;59(1):57-71.
<https://doi.org/10.36473/ujhss.v59i1.1052>
 21. Pflaeging J, Schleef E. *Sociolinguistic Competence in Curricula, Teacher Cognition and Classroom Practice: Research Gaps and Future Directions*. *Languages*. 2026;11(3):47.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/languages11030047>
 22. Barro-Punzalan SB. Sociolinguistics, Discourse and Literary Competences among English Language Studies Students. *Asia Pacific Journal of Management and Sustainable Development*. 2024;12(1):41-47.
<https://research.lpubatangas.edu.ph/wp-content/uploads/2024/07/4.-APJMSD-2024-09.pdf>
 23. Saffarian A, Ghonsooly B, Akbari O. Cultural and Social Intelligences and Their Relationship to the Ability of Student Translators When Translating Cultural and Social Texts. *Int J Comp Lit Transl Stud*. 2015;3(1):45-54.
<https://doi.org/10.7575/AIAC.IJCLTS.V.3N.1P.45>
 24. Yu MC. On the teaching and learning of L2 sociolinguistic competence in classroom settings. *Asian EFL Journal*. 2006;8(2):111-131.
https://web.archive.org/web/20180427030529id_/https://www.asian-efl-journal.com/June_2006_EBook_editions.pdf#page=111
 25. Gkonou C, Mercer S. Understanding emotional and social intelligence among English language teachers. 2017. ISBN:978-0-86355-842-9
https://www.teachingenglish.org.uk/sites/teacheng/files/pub_G211_ELTRA_Gkonou%20and%20Mercer%20paper_FINAL_web.pdf
 26. Ghalani L, Pahlavani P. Iranian EFL learners' social intelligence (SI) and willingness to communicate (WTC): The relationship and difference across gender. *International Journal of Research in English Education*. 1970;4(3):55-69.
<https://doi.org/10.29252/ijree.4.3.55>
 27. Dorgham R. Implementation of the Sociolinguistic Competence Strategies in Teaching and Learning English as a Foreign Language. *J Lang Teach Res*. 2024;15(4):1189-99.
<https://doi.org/10.17507/jltr.1504.16>
 28. Yang J, Rehner K. Learner beliefs about sociolinguistic competence: A qualitative case study of four university second language learners. *Lang Learn High Educ*. 2015:157-80.
<https://www.degruyterbrill.com/document/doi/10.1515/cercles-2015-0008/html?srsltid=AfmBOorJxnk4qWd31Eq1uEsuI3jpiMNNrjpyqmq49nzziXDV2eZvqsmG>
 29. Savignon SJ. Communicative competence. *TESOL Encycl Engl Lang Teach*. 2018:1-7.
<https://doi.org/10.1002/9781118784235.eelt0047>
 30. Mehar-Un-Nisa, Imdad D, Fatima SH. Social Intelligence as a Predictor of Academic Success among Graduate Students Based on their Gender. *SJESR*. 2024;7(3):32-38.
[https://doi.org/10.36902/sjesr-vol7-iss3-2024\(32-38\)](https://doi.org/10.36902/sjesr-vol7-iss3-2024(32-38))
 31. Saxena S, Jain KR. Social intelligence of undergraduate students. *IOSR J Res Method Educ*. 2009;1(1):1-4.
<https://doi.org/10.9790/7388-0110104>
 32. Vyroost J, Kyselova M. Personality correlates of social intelligence. *Stud Psychol*. 2006;48(3):207-12.
<https://www.proquest.com/openview/c9b56293e0985b18a44d3ad37997d9d0/1?pq-origsite=gscholar&cbl=75942>
 33. Silvera DH, Martinussen M, Dahl TI. The Tromso social intelligence scale. *Scand J Psychol*. 2001;42(4):313-9.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/1467-9450.00242>
 34. Taguchi N. Analysis of Appropriateness in a Speech Act of Request in L2 English. *Pragmatics*. 2006;16(4):513-33.
<https://doi.org/10.1075/prag.16.4.05tag>
 35. Adwan RE, Husayn MN. Social intelligence among teaching staff at Princess Rahma University College and its relationship to student's interaction with the

educational topic from students of Princess Rahma University College point of view. Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies. 2022;18(1):1046-1058.

doi: 10.52462/jlls.238

How to Cite: Al-Ghazo A, Huwari IF. Bridging Minds and Language: Social Intelligence and Sociolinguistic Competences Among EFL Learners. Int Res J Multidiscip Scope. 2026;7(3):1188-1199.
DOI: 10.47857/irjms.2026.v07i03.011353

Appendix A

Research Instruments

Part A: Social Intelligence Scale (SIS)

Purpose: To measure students' ability to understand and manage social interactions (33).

Instructions: Please read each statement and indicate how much you agree or disagree using the scale below:

1 = Strongly Disagree 2 = Disagree 3 = Neutral 4 = Agree 5 = Strongly Agree

No	Item	Strongly Disagree	Dis-agree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
1	I understand how my actions affect other people.					
2	I can predict how people will react in various situations.					
3	I find it easy to talk to new people.					
4	I am aware of the social rules in different settings.					
5	I can tell when someone is uncomfortable in a conversation.					
6	I am good at solving problems between people.					
7	I can easily adapt my behavior to suit different social situations.					
8	I notice small details in people's behavior that others might miss.					
9	I can usually sense when someone wants to change the topic.					
10	I am comfortable starting a conversation with strangers.					
11	I can explain things in a way that makes sense to different people.					
12	I know when to speak and when to listen in a conversation.					
13	I find it easy to make new friends.					
14	I can guess how someone feels even without them saying it.					
15	I am confident in group discussions.					
16	I can notice changes in someone's mood during a conversation.					
17	I am aware of the hidden meanings behind people's words.					
18	I adjust my tone depending on the person I'm speaking to.					
19	I can stay calm when dealing with difficult people.					
20	I am able to convince others during discussions.					
21	I can work well with people from different backgrounds.					

Part B: Sociolinguistic Appropriateness Test (34)**Scoring:**

0 = Inappropriate 1 = Partially appropriate 2 = Fully appropriate

No.	Situation	Options
1	You meet your university professor in the hallway. What do you say?	a) "Hey dude!"
2	You are invited to a formal dinner in a foreign country. What is the safest opening topic?	a) Politics
3	Your friend is late to class. What would you say?	a) "Where have you been? You're always late!"
4	You are meeting someone for the first time in a professional context.	a) "I'm John."
5	A classmate shares bad news. How do you respond?	a) "That's life."
6	You are in a country where handshaking is common. How do you greet a new colleague?	a) Nod without speaking
7	A teacher corrects your mistake in front of others. What do you do?	a) "You're wrong!"
8	Your friend uses an idiom you don't understand. What is the best response?	a) Nod silently
9	You are writing an email to a professor. How should you start?	a) "Dear Professor..."
10	You accidentally bump into someone on campus. What do you say?	a) "Watch where you're going!"