



Intercultural sensitivity and social intelligence: The Case of EFL internship undergraduate learners

Chaleomkiet Yenpdech ^a , Kampeeraphab Intanoo ^{b1} 

^a *Buriram Rajabhat University, English Program, Buriram 31000, Thailand*

^b *Buriram Rajabhat University, English Program, Buriram 31000, Thailand*

APA Citation:

Yenpdech, C. & Intanoo, K. (2022). Intercultural sensitivity and social intelligence: The Case of EFL internship undergraduate learners. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 18(2), 860-876

Submission Date:20/02/2022

Acceptance Date:30/03/2022

Abstract

This research was aimed to examine on the average level of intercultural sensitivity and social intelligence of EFL internship undergraduate learners. In addition to propose the correlation between intercultural sensitivity and social intelligence, the methodology segment of this investigation incorporates the populace, members, the instruments, the information assortment methodology, and the information examinations strategy of this investigation. The researchers decided the research by utilizing mixed-method research paradigm. The findings indicate that intercultural sensitivity and social intelligence have some positive effects on EFL internship undergraduate learners' performance. The correlation and distinction can be end up being measurably critical in the intercultural sensitivity and social intelligence for social contrasts temporary internship workplace. The purposes behind the positive correlation are on the grounds that individuals will participate in intercultural collaboration when undergraduate learners able to communicate with people in different societies. Additionally, they may learn more knowledge on different societies in correspondence. Furthermore, they could learn more about social intelligence in communication. The more they learn about different societies, the more they value cultural differences.

Keywords: Cultural differences; Intercultural sensitivity; Internship undergraduate learners; Social intelligence; Thai EFL

1. Introduction

Multiculturalism is defined in various ways (Devrim, 2020). The racial, religious, linguistic, and cultural differences make human beings of many races, but everyone is human alike, and must coexist on this planet. If human only thought that human were different, there would be a feeling of the divide. Looking back in the past few decades, we will find 'Globalization' mainly to show the impact of moving for political and economic consequences from developed countries to less developed countries. Causing the termination of the word 'Globalization' later and made it look like 'Internationalization' (IZN) is a separate part of globalization again (Blight et al., 1999: 15-31). Internationalization in political science and government in a century, and was brought into use in a serious study on the early 1980s, before many people may be familiar with the term. It has been

¹ Corresponding author.

E-mail address: Kampeeraphab.it@bru.ac.th

'international education', and in the 1990s it has often been used to emphasize the comparison of education and education for multiculturalism. Other terms have also emerged, such as transnational, borderless, and cross-border education, which Knight (2004) argues that the word 'borderless' appeared in 2000 British and Australian educational reports (Kanjaniyot, 2019).

Intercultural sensitivity can be characterized as “an effective in another culture, people must be interested in other cultures, be sensitive enough to notice cultural differences, and then also be willing to modify their behavior as an indication of respect for the people of other cultures” (Bhawuk & Brislin, 1992: 2) and Intercultural sensitivity can be defined as “an individual’s ability to develop emotion towards understanding and appreciating cultural differences that promotes appropriate, and effective behavior in intercultural communication” (Chen & Starosta, 1997: 5; Chen, 2009; Hammer, 1989).

According to the scholars' definition of social intelligence has been defined since ancient times by Edward Thorndike (1920) as the capacity to comprehend, and deal with individuals around, as well as acting smart in the matters of relational connections. In addition, some scholars say that social intelligence is when we know, and understand the social situation at the moment, and be capable of intelligently and correspondingly respond in relation to social circumstances at that time (Livermore, 2011: 5; Thomas & Inkson, 2004: 13-16; Thomas, 2006: 80-81).

Due to the abundance of cultural inflationary pressures, a person has to adapt and be ready to live in a multicultural society, regardless of internships. Students therefore need to have the experience, understanding and skills to communicate with people of various cultures in different institutions that can be adapted appropriately. Socially intelligent individuals adapt their own ways and attitudes to new cultural environments and are able to appreciate human differences and to treat others with respect, integrity, and compassion. Provided leadership that is adaptable in circumstances of cultural diversity. It is also capable of dealing with multicultural teams, including being able to identify, improve and sustain itself for work across cultures (Livermore, 2011: 9).

Social intelligence is the capacity to adapt to multiple conditions in which individuals in different societies include different life experiences, thinking, and behaving. Hence, in the investigation of social intelligence with such a specific cultural context. Consequently, results need to see all the more profoundly in that social setting. The cultural backgrounds of students practicing various internships of agencies, organizations, and associations are of importance and composition in this exploration. Using a mix of research methods to increase wider and finer comprehension. The knowledge obtained from this research will contribute to the creation of learning models to encourage intercultural sensitivity, and social intelligence for students in the next order.

1.1. Literature Review

In the past, most people would focus on intelligence quotient, or the name that everyone knows is IQ. In other words, people with intelligence are best able to achieve success, but later studies have shown that intelligence is not the only factor in making a person succeed, because the path to success is still required by relying on other elements as well (Phawacharoenphol, 2016: 9; Suriyo et. al., 2016: 13; Thongsueksai, 2009: 23-25). Each individual has to deal with his own emotions, which is why the study of Emotional Quotient, or the most well-known name of all, EQ. According to extensive studies on emotional intelligence, cognitive intelligence, and emotional intelligence are still inadequate. Since both types of intelligence are inherent in a person who is diverse, and requires further study.

1.1.1. Intercultural Sensitivity Longitudinal Model

In great intercultural correspondence, comprehension relies on the ability to see, react and consider contrasts, and similarities (Bennett, 1993; Bronfenbrenner et al., 1958; Chen, 1997).

Larke (2007) a Chinese clinician said an individual can have various characters relying upon the circumstance and the climate. For instance, at one time people knew us as educators however some other time at the youngsters' home apparent as a parent. Nonetheless, even in a similar period and a similar spot we generally have two personalities, or points of view. The view in which others see us, and the viewpoint we see ourselves. Sensitivity of Intercultural is a theory that sums up human conduct to show social sensitivity, and variation to culture that are unique in relation to oneself which is isolated into two fundamental ones as follows: 1) Ethnocentric or adherence to their own identity

and culture, these individuals have three unmistakable responses when confronted with various societies: 1.1) Denial: individuals in this classification are invulnerable, don't open their brains to learning new things and accept. Just their own way of life simply by some other culture would not be acknowledged. 1.2) Defense: this second kind of perceive and acknowledged that there are different societies in their own way of life, however maintained the rule that the best is in all honesty, and 1.3) Minimization third class is the lessening of certainty and modesty, as well, respected by different societies past their own way of life and are consistently in all-out attack mode or recognize their social and social ties are, and 2) Ethno relative is the group that learns and is more open minded than the first group and has studied and learned other cultures. In order to accept or adjust to coexistence in society, it is also divided into three categories: 2.1) Acceptation, that is to accept that in society there are people who are rich in language and cultural differences Respect people with a culture different from theirs but who still adhere to their own culture. 2.2) Adaptation refers to trying to adapt from one's own culture which is another one as described above. Adaptation to another culture doesn't mean making a huge difference from hand to back to make it totally unique, yet to adjust to the circumstance or climate around then over the long run, and 2.3) Integrate culture as is still old, but it was a new culture into which it is integrated perfectly. Learning how to react, adapt, or sensitize to multiculturalism will help us to understand more easily each person's personality and identity. It is also able to persuade or enable people with a closed view to open up to learn different cultures, so that people in society have greater understanding, and coexist in peaceful diversity.

Bennett (2017) formative model of intercultural sensitivity clarifies this in six phases-three of them ethnocentric, and three of them ethno relative. The main stage characterizes ethnocentrism as the demeanor or perspective from which the universe is divided as per the limits of our own culture. It regularly involves the conviction that one's racial background gathering is the most appropriate, or on the other hand that a couple or all parts of our society and culture are better than those of different societies. The ethnocentrism stages were as follows: 1) Refusal: the interpretation of social contrasts by the unaided eye (preparations, circumstances, meat, apparel, etc.) however the rejection of more inborn comparisons. 2) Safeguard: convicting various cultures in derogatory or harsh words on account of feeling humiliated, which leads to negative generalizations, prejudices, and discriminatory perspectives, and 3) Minimization: suggesting that quality and behavior are universal norms and are identical to one's own. The next stage is ethno relativism, a scholarly capacity where a person intentionally perceives qualities, and practices as a social problem rather than an all-inclusive one. The stages of ethno relativism as follows: 1) Acknowledgement: the belief that social contrasts must be recognized in order to strengthen associations. We might not be in agreement with a specific social norm or distinction, while we recognize the attributes of a colleague. 2) Transformation: to have the option of modifying a social perspective or conduct that increases understanding and correspondence in different social settings, and 3) Combination: a movement to integrate different social elements and feel positive about multi-social circumstances.

1.1.2. Theories Concerning Social Intelligence

Bandura (1986: 2002) introduced the theory of social intelligence by addressing the learning of individuals through observation, and behavioral behavior of individuals in society was viewed as: Behavior of individuals interacting with two main factors: Cognitive and other Personal Factors and Environmental Influences. The learning from observation is about the processing of news, where the news here refers to written words. Characteristics or details of the behavior, and environment of the show. Human behavior learns to show most of the behavior from observing the model, and receives the information and processes it by converting it to a symbolic representation that will be a machine.

Albrecht (2009) contends that human knowledge isn't only intelligent, or as we probably are aware it IQ. Emotional intelligence (Goleman, 1995-1997; Sternberg, 2000) demonstrates that 'Social Intelligence' is the capacity to coexist well with others and empower others to participate. While the meaning of social insight may sound basic, procuring this capacity requires being touchy to the necessities and interests of others and to have a big-hearted and empathetic mentality. Be compassionate, and should have what it takes to interface with others, paying little heed to the circumstance. Social knowledge subsequently has five parts. Furthermore, the knowledge people have created to utilize it in quest for achievement in work, individual life, and so forth. The emergence of social intelligence and the need to improve such intelligence is in all adults. Whether students,

managers or employees in various occupations may help to minimize tension and increase cooperation. Although intolerance, stubbornness and disunity is replaced by shared awareness and synergy to achieve a common objective. Social intelligence has five components, abbreviated as SPACE, a combination of the first letters of the five elements: 1) Situational awareness: the ability to read situations and to recognize human relationships in each situation. 2) Presence: Your verbal and non-verbal gestures influence your image in the minds of others. 3) Authenticity: the behavior that makes others judges you to be truthful, transparent, and genuine. 4) Clarity: the capacity to explain ideas and to convey opinions, and 5) Empathy: the desire to link to others.

Another few research has shown that social intelligence is possesses multiple dimensions, and identifiable from general knowledge spaces (Jones & Day, 1997; Marlowe, 1986; Weis & Süb, 2007; Wong, Day, Maxwell & Meara, 1995). These ideas of social intelligence consolidate domestic and foreign recognition, social skills, and other psycho-social factors.

1.1.3. Synopsis of Social Intelligence

1. Personality Model with Five Dimensions

Personality determines the example of an individual's feelings, contemplations and activities that are robust and extraordinary to any person (Cervone & Pervin, 2009) by arranging a grouping of characters of the most popular sort (Costa & McCrae, 1992) in the five-part components: 1) Neuroticism is a person who often has anxiety, often feels anger, depression, and even self-consciousness. 2) Extraversion is a person who gives a feeling of warmth, likes to coexist with others, is assertive, likes activities, likes to seek excitement, and often has a positive mood. 3) Openness to experience is a person with high imagination, aesthetics, good perception, likes to do new things, has new ideas and likes to revisit their values. 4) Agreeableness is to be a trustworthy person, direct, altruistic, submit to others humble and often weak-minded, and 5) Conscientiousness is to be competent, orderly, and responsible for duties, want success, self-discipline and prudence.

2. Intercultural Adjustment

Intercultural adaptation is an intercultural adjustment that is used to modify the behavior of interactions in order to achieve mutual understanding, or to reduce misunderstandings between people from different cultures (Cai & Rodriguez, 1996). The behavior changes in two dimensions including 1) Psychological Adjustment is the adjustment of negative emotions. Furthermore, the ability to manage stress of being exposed to situations with a different cultural context from their traditional culture to achieve life satisfaction, and well-being happiness, and 2) Socio-Cultural Adjustment is the adjustment of behavior, expression until the ability to express, or act in a way that is consistent, and appropriate to the cultural environment that is different from the traditional culture (Ward & Kennedy, 1999).

3. Cultural Intelligence

Cultural intelligence is described as a person's ability to enable a person to live effectively in a multicultural situation (Early & Ang, 2003; Ang, Van Dyne, & Koh, 2006; Ang & Van Dyne, 2008b; Mayer & Salovey, 1993; Sternberg, 2000). There are effective cultural differences (Thomas, 2006) are made up of four key components: 1) Metacognitive CQ is the assessment of a person's thinking as they interact in order to acquire knowledge, and cultural understanding. 2) Cognitive CQ is where a person has knowledge about the norm practicing different cultures, 3) Motivational CQ is the effort of individuals to focus, and exert themselves on multicultural learning, and 4) Behavioral CQ is an assertive expression of a person both verbal and body language while interacting with people of different cultures (Ang & Van Dyne, 2008b; Ford & Tisak, 1983). The disguise of multicultural mindfulness and the capacity to cooperate gainfully across social contrasts as follow:

Ethnocentric Stages			Ethno relative Stages		
<i>Denial</i>	<i>Defense</i>	<i>Minimalization</i>	<i>Acceptance</i>	<i>Adaptation</i>	<i>Integration</i>
First experience is not to experience the difference.	Polarization of us/them.	False sense of cultural sensitivity, assumes we are all the same.	Growing awareness of one's own culture and recognition of the order.	Recognition that one needs to be effective in interactions with others.	Internalizing two or more cultures - typically takes 3+ years.

Figure 1. Development of Intercultural Sensitivity V.S. Experience of Difference

As found in Figure 1 above, the scale to portrays the standard manners by which individuals experience, decipher, and connect across social contrasts (Bennett, 1986).

1.1.4. Research Objectives

1. To investigate the average level of intercultural sensitivity of EFL internship undergraduate learners.
2. To investigate the average level of social intelligence of EFL internship undergraduate learners.
3. To propose the correlation between intercultural sensitivity and social intelligence.

1.1.5. Research Questions

1. What is the average level of intercultural sensitivity of EFL internship undergraduate learners?
2. What is the average level of social intelligence of EFL internship undergraduate learners?
3. What are the correlation among intercultural sensitivity and social intelligence?

1.1.6. Definition of Key Terms

1. EFL Internship Undergraduate Learners makes reference to the process of organizing teaching and learning activities shared by the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences at Buriram Rajabhat University, Thailand and other organizations, or departments. The goal is to give English Program (EFL) learners in a workplace that matches the type of professional they would like study. Learners gained theoretical and practical knowledge concurrently in the real world, allowing for hands-on experience.

2. Intercultural Sensitivity alludes to EFL students' (English Program) development patterns of multicultural susceptibility to behavior, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Buriram Rajabhat University, Thailand. Whereas leaving for a fourth-year internship in semester two of the 2020 academic year. From demonstrating Intercultural Sensitivity and adapting to cultures other than one's own.

3. Social Intelligence relates to the ability to assess and perceive the emotions of English Program students (EFL) is referred to as social intelligence. Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences Buriram Rajabhat University, Thailand that occurred in society, or among the people around them, as well as the ability to respond appropriately to situations that arose during the internship experience.

2. Method

2.1. Research Design

The methodology segment of this investigation incorporates the populace, members, the instruments, the information assortment methodology, and the information examinations strategy of this investigation. The researchers at that point decided the researchers by utilizing mixed-method research paradigm.

2.2. Population

The population density of the insights provided in the fourth year of English (EFL) was patched one out of 43, and patched two out of 42 undergraduate students, each of which returned from internships in various regions of Thailand and abroad. There's a total of 85 people in that as well.

2.3. Research Participants

Participants were English major fourth year students from Buriram Rajabhat University, Thailand. We chose these as the focus of sampling to provide an agent test of the qualities of English major internship students from a variety of companies. The 70 participants from the internship participated in a study which calculated the sample size of Krejcie & Morgan (1970), and selected using a method of simple random sampling (Lottery).

Section 1: General data

Table 1. Gender, Years

Gender	Frequency	Percentage
Male	12	17.10
Female	58	82.90
Total	70	100
Years	Frequency	Percentage
Fourth	70	100
Total	70	100

Table 1, showed that most of them were female, 58 out of 82.9 percentages, and 12 males out of 17.10 percentages. In term of years, it was found that the sample group was at the fourth year level, with 70 individuals, or 100 percentages.

Table 2. Mean and Standard deviation showing of GPA.

Academic Result	Mean	Std. Deviation
GPA.	2.99	0.46

Table 2, showed that the sample group had an average mean grade of 2.99.

Table 3. Internship locations by region and abroad

Regions	Internship learners	Percentage (%)
Northeastern	28	40.00
Central	9	12.86
Eastern	4	5.71
Southern	24	34.29
Northern	4	5.71
Abroad	1	1.43
Total	70	100

The sample group was divided by region, ranked from highest to lowest among the top three, as shown in table 3: 1) The Northeast has 28 people, or 40% of the population. 2) The Southern has 24 people, or 34.29 percent, and the Central region has 9 people, or 12.86 percent, respectively.

Section 2: A synthesis of the distinction of mean among Gender and GPA.

Table 4. The mean scores using cumulative methods.

Gender	GPA.		<i>t</i>	p-value
	Mean	Std. Deviation		
Male	2.92	0.3596	-0.72	0.48
Female	3.01	0.4762		

From table 4, males had a mean GPA of 2.92, and female GPA of 3.01 had a significant mean GPA of 0.48. It was presumed that there was no distinction in mean scores between genders.

2.4. Research Instrumentation and Procedures

1. The survey comprised of three sections with the mix of two self-assessment scales. Section one gave an overall prologue to the creator, and the instruments. This study adopted of the 24-statements an Intercultural Sensitivity Scale comprising five factors by means of Chen and Starosta (2000), and the scale of The Tromsø Social Intelligence, consisting of three factors (these identified were Social Information Processing, Social Skills as well as Social Awareness) with a 21-statement scale, was differentiated (Silvera et al., 2001). 5-likert scale, and the choices were: 5=strongly agree to 1=strongly disagree. They completed intercultural sensitivity in English version within about 15 minutes in class, and the 21-items of social intelligence into 12 minutes, among the total totally 45 items. The questionnaire was used to find the reliability value of 45 students who graduated and completed their internship training. The reliability of the questionnaire was .965.

2. Semi-structured interviews were conducted by the authors. These are open-ended questions effective for In-depth interviews, and received five experts feedback on the quality of the tools with an IOC of 0.95 and *a content validity for scale*, S -CVI = 0.85 (Davis, 1992; Grant & Davis, 1997; Polit & Beck, 2004; Waltz et al., 2005: 155 ; Waltz & Bausell, 1981: 71).

2.5. Data collection procedures

The researchers approached the Research and Development Institute of Buriram Rajabhat University for a letter requesting permission to collect research data. Then, request permission to conduct research on a sample. During the organization of EFL internship undergraduate students on orientation program in English Academic year 2020, 20 February 2020.

2.6. Data analysis

The fundamental tests from the computer program had been used dissect the information from the review surveys. The expressive test was led to recognize the percentages, mean, standard deviation, the multivariate regression correlation test was applied to discover the plausible relationships between the intercultural sensitivity and social intelligence. Content analysis from in-depth interviews.

3. Results

Section 3: A synthesis of correlation between intercultural sensitivity and social intelligence.

Table 5. The correlation between intercultural sensitivity of statement No.1 with social intelligence

Intercultural Sensitivity	Correlation	Social Intelligence	
		No.1	No. 2
No.1	Spearman's rho	.326**	.359**
	Sig. (two-tailed)	0.006	0.002
	N	70	70

** $p < 0.01$ (two-tailed).

From table 5, the correlation between intercultural sensitivity was positively associated with social intelligence in statement no. 1 and 2 at a level of 0.01 ($r_s = 0.326$, and $r_s = 0.359$), respectively.

Table 6. The correlation between intercultural sensitivity of statement No.2 with social intelligence

Intercultural Sensitivity	Correlation	Social Intelligence		
		No.8	No.11	No.12
No.2	Spearman's rho	.426**	.534**	.450**
	Sig. (two-tailed)	0.000	0.000	0.000
	N	70	70	70

** $p < 0.01$ (two-tailed).

From table 6, the correlation between intercultural sensitivity was positively associated with social intelligence in statement no. 8, 11, and 12 at a level of 0.01 ($r_s = 0.426$, $r_s = 0.534$, and $r_s = 0.450$), respectively.

Table 7. The correlation between intercultural sensitivity of statement No.3 with social intelligence

Intercultural Sensitivity	Correlation	Social Intelligence		
		No.14	No.17	No.18
No.3	Spearman's rho	.276*	.399**	.368**
	Sig. (two-tailed)	0.021	0.001	0.002
	N	70	70	70

** $p < 0.01$ (two-tailed).

From table 7, the correlation between intercultural sensitivity was positively associated with social intelligence in statement no.17, and 18 at a level of 0.01 ($r_s = 0.399$, and $r_s = 0.368$), respectively.

Table 8. The correlation between intercultural sensitivity of statement No.4 with social intelligence

Intercultural Sensitivity	Correlation	Social Intelligence		
		No.3	No.5	No.6
No.4	Spearman's rho	.253*	.248*	.279*
	Sig. (two-tailed)	0.035	0.038	0.019
	N	70	70	70

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$ (two-tailed).

From table 8, the correlation between intercultural sensitivity was positively associated with social intelligence in statement no.3 at a level of 0.01 ($r_s = 0.253$), and there was a statistically significant positive correlation of social intelligence statement no. 5, and 6 at the 0.05 level ($r_s = 0.253$, $r_s = 0.248$ and $r_s = 0.279$), respectively.

Table 9. The correlation between intercultural sensitivity of statement No.5 with social intelligence

Intercultural Sensitivity	Correlation	Social Intelligence		
		No.1	No.5	No.16
No.5	Spearman's rho	.319**	.343**	.405**
	Sig. (two-tailed)	0.007	0.004	0.001
	N	70	70	70

** $p < 0.01$ (two-tailed).

From table 9, the correlation between intercultural sensitivity was positively associated with social intelligence in statement no.1, 5, and 16 at a level of 0.01 ($r_s = 0.319$, $r_s = 0.343$, and $r_s = 0.405$), respectively.

Table 10. The correlation between intercultural sensitivity of statement No.6 with social intelligence

Intercultural Sensitivity	Correlation	Social Intelligence		
		No.1	No.2	No.18
No.6	Spearman's rho	.306**	.339**	.388**
	Sig. (two-tailed)	0.01	0.004	0.001
	N	70	70	70

** $p < 0.01$ (two-tailed).

From table 10, the correlation between intercultural sensitivity was positively associated with social intelligence in statement no.1, 2, and 18 at a level of 0.01 ($r_s = 0.306$, $r_s = 0.339$, and $r_s = 0.388$), respectively.

Table 11. The correlation between intercultural sensitivity of statement No.7 with social intelligence

Intercultural Sensitivity	Correlation	Social Intelligence		
		No.4	No.16	No.20
No.7	Spearman's rho	.418**	.496**	.442**
	Sig. (two-tailed)	0.000	0.000	0.000
	N	70	70	70

** $p < 0.01$ (two-tailed).

From table 11, the correlation between intercultural sensitivity was positively associated with social intelligence in statement no.4, 16, and 20 at a level of 0.01 ($r_s = 0.418$, $r_s = 0.496$, and $r_s = 0.442$), respectively.

Table 12. The correlation between intercultural sensitivity of statement No.9 with social intelligence

Intercultural Sensitivity	Correlation	Social Intelligence		
		No.8	No.11	No.16
No.9	Spearman's rho	.529**	.539**	.503**
	Sig. (two-tailed)	0.000	0.000	0.000
	N	70	70	70

** $p < 0.01$ (two-tailed).

From table 12, the correlation between intercultural sensitivity was positively associated with social intelligence in statement no.8, 11, and 16 at a level of 0.01 ($r_s = 0.529$, $r_s = 0.539$, and $r_s = 0.503$), respectively.

Table 13. The correlation between intercultural sensitivity of statement No.10 with social intelligence

Intercultural Sensitivity	Correlation	Social Intelligence		
		No.6	No.13	No.21
No.10	Spearman's rho	.288*	.285*	.245*
	Sig. (two-tailed)	0.016	0.017	0.041
	N	70	70	70

** $p < 0.01$ (two-tailed).

From Table 13, the relationship between Intercultural Sensitivity was positively correlated with Social Intelligence on no.6, 13, and 21 at the level 0.05 ($r_s = 0.288$, $r_s = 0.285$, and $r_s = 0.245$), respectively.

Table 14. The correlation between intercultural sensitivity of statement No.11 with social intelligence

Intercultural Sensitivity	Correlation	Social Intelligence		
		No.3	No.8	No.21
No.11	Spearman's rho	.335**	.320**	.330**
	Sig. (two-tailed)	0.005	0.007	0.005
	N	70	70	70

** $p < 0.01$ (two-tailed).

From table 14, the correlation between intercultural sensitivity was positively associated with social intelligence in statement no.3, 8, and 21 at a level of 0.01 ($r_s = 0.335$, $r_s = 0.320$, and $r_s = 0.330$), respectively.

Table 15. The correlation between intercultural sensitivity of statement No.12 with social intelligence

Intercultural Sensitivity	Correlation	Social Intelligence		
		No.11	No.16	No.21
No.12	Spearman's rho	.402**	.483**	.441**
	Sig. (two-tailed)	0.001	0.000	0.000
	N	70	70	70

** $p < 0.01$ (two-tailed).

From table 15, the correlation between intercultural sensitivity was positively associated with social intelligence in statement no.11, 16, and 21 at a level of 0.01 ($r_s = 0.402$, $r_s = 0.483$, and $r_s = 0.441$), respectively.

Table 16. The correlation between intercultural sensitivity of statement No.13 with social intelligence

Intercultural Sensitivity	Correlation	Social Intelligence		
		No.2	No.7	No.20
No.13	Spearman's rho	.341**	.292*	-.312**
	Sig. (two-tailed)	0.004	0.014	0.008
	N	70	70	70

* $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$ (two-tailed).

From Table 16, finding correlation was found that the level of correlation between Intercultural Sensitivity was positively correlated with Social Intelligence on no.2 at a statistically significant level of 0.01 ($r_s = 0.341$), and no.7 at a statistically significant level of 0.05 ($r_s = 0.292$). Negative correlation with no.20 was statistically significant at the level of 0.01 ($r_s = -0.312$), respectively.

Table 17. The correlation between intercultural sensitivity of statement No.14 with social intelligence.

Intercultural Sensitivity	Correlation	Social Intelligence		
		No.1	No.2	No.6
No.14	Spearman's rho	.368**	.414**	.339**
	Sig. (two-tailed)	0.002	0.000	0.004
	N	70	70	70

** $p < 0.01$ (two-tailed).

From table 17, the correlation between intercultural sensitivity was positively associated with social intelligence in statement no.1, 2, and 6 at a level of 0.01 ($r_s = 0.368$, $r_s = 0.414$, and $r_s = 0.339$), respectively.

Table 18. The correlation between intercultural sensitivity of statement No.15 with social intelligence

Intercultural Sensitivity	Correlation	Social Intelligence		
		No.11	No.13	No.16
No.15	Spearman's rho	.529**	.488**	.467**
	Sig. (two-tailed)	0.000	0.000	0.000
	N	70	70	70

** $p < 0.01$ (two-tailed).

From table 18, the correlation between intercultural sensitivity was positively associated with social intelligence in statement no.11, 13, and 16 at a level of 0.01 ($r_s = 0.529$, $r_s = 0.488$, and $r_s = 0.467$), respectively.

Table 19. The correlation between intercultural sensitivity of statement No.16 with social intelligence

Intercultural Sensitivity	Correlation	Social Intelligence	
		No.18	No.20
No.16	Spearman's rho	.238*	-.238*
	Sig. (two-tailed)	0.047	0.048
	N	70	70

* $p < 0.05$ (two-tailed).

From table 19, the correlation between intercultural sensitivity was positively associated with social intelligence in statement no.18 at a level of 0.05 ($r_s = 0.238$), and had a negative correlation with no.20 significantly at the 0.05 level ($r_s = -0.238$), respectively.

Table 20. The correlation between intercultural sensitivity of statement No.17 with social intelligence

Intercultural Sensitivity	Correlation	Social Intelligence		
		No.2	No.6	No.7
No.17	Spearman's rho	.383**	.324**	.349**
	Sig. (two-tailed)	0.001	0.006	0.003
	N	70	70	70

** $p < 0.01$ (two-tailed).

From table 20, the correlation between intercultural sensitivity was positively associated with social intelligence in statement no.2, 6, and 7 at a level of 0.01 ($r_s = 0.383$, $r_s = 0.324$, and $r_s = 0.349$), respectively.

Table 21. The correlation between intercultural sensitivity of statement No.18 with social intelligence

Intercultural Sensitivity	Correlation	Social Intelligence		
		No.8	No.11	No.16
No.18	Spearman's rho	.400**	.444**	.451**
	Sig. (two-tailed)	0.001	0.000	0.000
	N	70	70	70

** $p < 0.01$ (two-tailed).

From table 21, the correlation between intercultural sensitivity was positively associated with social intelligence in statement no.8, 11, and 16 at a level of 0.01 ($r_s = 0.400$, $r_s = 0.444$, and $r_s = 0.451$), respectively.

Table 22. The correlation between intercultural sensitivity of statement No.19 with social intelligence

Intercultural Sensitivity	Correlation	Social Intelligence		
		No.3	No.8	No.11
No.19	Spearman's rho	.500**	.421**	.567**
	Sig. (two-tailed)	0.000	0.000	0.000
	N	70	70	70

** $p < 0.01$ (two-tailed).

From table 22, the correlation between intercultural sensitivity was positively associated with social intelligence in statement no.3, 8, and 11 at a level of 0.01 ($r_s = 0.500$, $r_s = 0.421$, and $r_s = 0.567$), respectively.

Table 23. The correlation between intercultural sensitivity of statement No.20 with social intelligence

Intercultural Sensitivity	Correlation	Social Intelligence		
		No.3	No.8	No.11
No.20	Spearman's rho	.476**	.528**	.609**
	Sig. (two-tailed)	0.000	0.000	0.000
	N	70	70	70

** $p < 0.01$ (two-tailed).

From table 23, the correlation between intercultural sensitivity was positively associated with social intelligence in statement no.3, 8, and 11 at a level of 0.01 ($r_s = 0.476$, $r_s = 0.528$, and $r_s = 0.609$), respectively.

Table 24. The correlation between intercultural sensitivity of statement No.21 with social intelligence

Intercultural Sensitivity	Correlation	Social Intelligence		
		No.2	No.9	No.14
No.21	Spearman's rho	.417**	.491**	.393**
	Sig. (two-tailed)	0.000	0.000	0.001
	N	70	70	70

** $p < 0.01$ (two-tailed).

From table 24, the correlation between intercultural sensitivity was positively associated with social intelligence in statement no.2, 9, and 14 at a level of 0.01 ($r_s = 0.417$, $r_s = 0.491$, and $r_s = 0.393$), respectively.

Table 25. The correlation between intercultural sensitivity of statement No.22 with social intelligence

Intercultural Sensitivity	Correlation	Social Intelligence		
		No.12	No.15	No.17
No.22	Spearman's rho	.387**	.381**	.370**
	Sig. (two-tailed)	0.001	0.001	0.002
	N	70	70	70

** $p < 0.01$ (two-tailed).

From table 25, the correlation between intercultural sensitivity was positively associated with social intelligence in statement no.12, 15, and 17 at a level of 0.01 ($r_s = 0.387$, $r_s = 0.381$, and $r_s = 0.370$), respectively.

Table 26. The correlation between intercultural sensitivity of statement No.23 with social intelligence

Intercultural Sensitivity	Correlation	Social Intelligence		
		No.1	No.3	No.18
No.23	Spearman's rho	.412**	.412**	.486**
	Sig. (two-tailed)	0.000	0.000	0.000
	N	70	70	70

** $p < 0.01$ (two-tailed).

From table 26, the correlation between intercultural sensitivity was positively associated with social intelligence in statement no.1, 3, and 18 at a level of 0.01 ($r_s = 0.412$, $r_s = 0.412$, and $r_s = 0.486$), respectively.

Table 27. The correlation between intercultural sensitivity of statement No.24 with social intelligence

Intercultural Sensitivity	Correlation	Social Intelligence		
		No.6	No.9	No.18
No.24	Spearman's rho	.385**	.376**	.408**
	Sig. (two-tailed)	0.001	0.001	0.000
	N	70	70	70

** $p < 0.01$ (two-tailed).

From table 27, the correlation between intercultural sensitivity was positively associated with social intelligence in statement no.6, 9, and 18 at a level of 0.01 ($r_s = 0.385$, $r_s = 0.376$, and $r_s = 0.408$), respectively.

4. Discussion

The gender standards for the intercultural sensitivity and social intelligence subscales. A progression of t-tests was directed to distinguish gender orientation contrasts in the factor from Table 5. None of these investigations demonstrated a critical relationship among gender and GPA.

Qualitative research by purposive sampling was used to select the five EFL internship participants who took part in the study. The data from in-depth interviews demonstrating adaptation to intercultural Sensitivity and social intelligence by EFL Internship Undergraduate Learners are shown below.

“The secret to my internship to be successful is that the goal must be clear, that is to say. The purposes of my own internship are to prepare all areas for the success of the intended outcome. After finishing my internship period, I have had the opportunity to learn, and gain real work life experience.”

“Getting ready before I leave for work is an absolute necessity for me. I've learned how to adapt to my surroundings outside of university and gain internship experience in order to apply for jobs. Being kind to others and not causing controversy in the internship site under any circumstances. The most sensitive and cautious of all is the affair with the internship personnel.”

“I occasionally think outside the box. And try to come up with new ideas for mutual success by putting concrete success and internship details in my resume or portfolio. Keep this in mind. I do not disclose company confidential information or customer information in a timely and adaptable manner. I communicate in words or in a polite manner, even in a peer group, and if there is a problem, I contact the intern immediately.”

“I need to learn more about the organization and look for opportunities to participate in every corporate event to broaden my knowledge while also assisting in the development of interpersonal relationships. I try to be as open to new experiences as possible. The more open you are to new ideas and meeting new people, the more you will learn. Don't be afraid to ask questions; you're not expected to know everything during your internship. So, if you're starting a new job, don't be afraid to ask questions. A person who knows how to ask is stupid for a moment, but a person who does not ask at all is stupid forever.”

“Enjoyed my internship life as it was one of the best experiences of my life. Therefore, it should be fun to work and learn, work with enthusiasm and have a positive attitude. I do every assignment with

great enthusiasm and professionalism to demonstrate my commitment to work. It's important to me to avoid negative behaviours such as swearing, disrespecting my coworkers, arriving late but returning first, pettiness, not being punctual, arrogant, and inappropriately dressed.”

Intercultural sensitivity and social intelligence in cultural behaviour can explain the EFL Internship Undergraduate Learners' overall intercultural adaptation. This could be due to learners interacting with employees of an organization, agency, company, or internship in critical situations. Cultural differences establish interaction skills and validate both cultural knowledge, and assertiveness, resulting in a greater cultural understanding and the ability to express themselves in situations where there is a difference. Cultural differences can be beneficial and have a positive impact on the efficiency and satisfaction of the EFE learners' internship. This one has a beneficial impact on intercultural adaptation. Another factor influencing the overall intercultural adaptation of the EFL Internship Undergraduate Learners is intercultural sensitivity and social intelligence, which is strongly associated with research Bennett (1993), Bronfenbrenner et al., (1958), Çiloğlan & Bardakçı (2019), Chen (1997), Goleman (1995-1997), Kural (2020), Silvera et al., (2001), and Sternberg (2000). Participants' Intercultural Sensitivity and Social Intelligence on Adaptation in Culturally Diverse Situations.

5. Conclusions

The study's findings indicate that intercultural sensitivity and social intelligence have some positive effects on EFL Internship Undergraduate Learners' performance. The correlation and distinction can be end up being measurably critical in the intercultural sensitivity and social intelligence for social contrasts temporary internship workplace. The purposes behind the positive correlation are on the grounds that individuals will participate in intercultural collaboration when undergraduate learners able to communicate with people in different societies. Additionally, they may learn more knowledge on different societies in correspondence. Furthermore, they could learn more about social intelligence in communication. The more they learn about different societies, the more they value cultural differences. Implications for research and practice: proposing training and development in intercultural sensitivity and social intelligence with EFL undergrad learners to enable them to modify negative emotions and feelings caused by cultural differences, such as discouragement or frustration. This additionally incorporates the capacity to manage the pressure and anxiety that comes of dealing with cultural differences.

6. Recommendations

Knowledge about the composition of intercultural sensitivity and social intelligence has been discovered through research. Evolve cultural intelligence in a context in the cultural context of the EFL Internship Undergraduate Learners. They should be developed concurrently because it is a progression that corresponds to the true structure of the cultural context.

The investigation's findings indicate that there was a positive influence on both intercultural adaptation as a whole and adjusting the attitude of EFL Internship Undergraduate Learners to a culture of difference would be difficult and time-consuming. However, universities can accomplish this through the organization's social transfer process (Organizational Socialization). By identifying opportunities and benefits gained by being open to new experiences and cultures, followed by training to lay the groundwork for promoting the learner's attitude toward being a good person. It is open to new experiences, followed by providing learners with the opportunity to attend training or study visits to locations, particularly organizations and agencies with effective diversity management. Giving a valuable reward to a learner who can demonstrate effective exposure to experience and intercultural adaptation to encourage the practitioner and serve as a model for other learners is one example.

7. Ethics Committee Approval

The authors confirm that the study does not need ethics committee approval according to the research integrity rules in their country. (Date of Confirmation: 02.06.2021)

Acknowledgements

Many thanks the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences at Buriram Rajabhat University in Thailand funded this research. All participants should be thanked for piloting and delivering field research data

References

- Albrecht, K. (2009). *Social Intelligence: The New Science of Success*. San Francisco: A Wiley Imprint.
- Ang, S., Van Dyne, L., & Koh, S. K. (2006). Personality Correlates of the Four-Factor Model of Cultural Intelligence. *Group and Organization Management*, 31, 100-123.
- Ang, S., & Van Dyne, L. (2008) Conceptualization of Cultural intelligence: Definition, Distinctiveness and nomological network, in Ang and Van Dyne (Eds) *Handbook of cultural intelligence: Theory measurement and applications*, London: M.E. Sharpe, pp. 3-15.
- Bennett, M. J. (1993). *Towards Ethnorelativism: A development model of intercultural sensitivity*. In R. M. Paige (Ed.). *Education for the intercultural experience*, Yarmouth, ME: Intercultural Press, pp.21-71.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social Foundations of Thought and Action: A Social Cognitive Theory*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Bandura, A. (2002) Social cognitive theory in cultural context. *Applied psychology: An International Review*, 51, 269-290.
- Bennett, M. J. (1986). A developmental approach to training for intercultural sensitivity. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations*, 10(2), 179-196.
- Bennett, M. J. (2017) *Development model of intercultural sensitivity*. In Kim, Y (ed) *International encyclopedia of intercultural communication*. Wiley.
- Bhawuk, D. P. S., & Brislin, R. W. (1992). *The measurement of intercultural sensitivity using the concepts of individualism and collectivism*. Retrieved 22 January, 2020 from <http://europskiput.com/media/sazetak-hrv-zg-Booklet-Intercultural-Sensitivity.pdf>
- Blight, D., Davis, D., & Olsen, A. (1999). The internationalisation of higher education. *Higher education through open and distance learning*, 15-31.
- Bronfenbrenner, U., Harding, J., & Gallwey, M. (1958). *The Measurement of Skill in Social Perception*. In McClelland, D. C. (Ed.), *Talent and Society*. New York: Van Nostrand.
- Cai, D. A., & Rodriguez, J. I. (1996-1997). Adjusting to Cultural Differences: The Intercultural Adaptation Model. *Intercultural Communication Studies*, 6(2), 31-42.
- Cervone, D., & Pervin, L. A. (2018). *Personality: Theory and Research (4th eds.)*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Chen, G. M., & Starosta, W. J. (1997). A review of the concept of intercultural sensitivity. *Human Communication*, 1, 1-16.
- Chen, G. M., & Starosta, W. J. (2000). The Development and Validation of the Intercultural Sensitivity scale. *Human Communication*, 3, 1-15.
- Çiloğlan, F., & Bardakçı, M. (2019). The Relationship between Intercultural Sensitivity and English Language Achievement. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies*, 15(3), 1204-1214. Doi: 10.17263/jlls.631563
- Costa, P. T., & McCrae, R. R. (1992). Normal personality assessment in clinical practice: The NEO Personality Inventory. *Psychological Assessment*, 4(1), 5-13.
- Davis, L. L. (1992). Instrument review: Getting the most from your panel of experts. *Applied Nursing Research*, 5, 194-197.
- Devrim, E. (2020). Multicultural Competence Scale for Prospective Teachers: Development, Validation and Measurement Invariance. *Eurasian Journal of Educational Research*, 87, 1-28.
- Early, P. C., & Ang, S. (2003). *Cultural Intelligence: Individual Interactions across Culture*. Stanford Business Books, Stanford, 12-18.
- Ford, M. E., & Tisak, M. S. (1983). A further search for social intelligence. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 75(2), 196-206.

- Franko, K. (2012). *Intercultural communication - The effect of difference in everyday working environment of companies (from Germany, Switzerland, Austria) in Hungary*. EconPapers: 767-773. Retrieved 22 January, 2020 from <http://econpapers.repec.org>
- Grant, J. S., & Davis, L. T. (1997). Selection and use of content experts in instrument development. *Research in Nursing & Health, 20*, 269-274.
- Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence*. New York: Bantam Books.
- Goleman, D. (1997). Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ. *The Psychologist-Manager Journal, 1*(1), 21-22.
- Hammer, M. R. (1989). *Intercultural communication competence*. In M. K. Asante & W. B. Gudykunst (Eds.), *Handbook of international and intercultural communication* (pp. 247-260). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Isariyawat, C., Yenphech, C. & Intanoo, K. (2020). The role of literature and literary texts in an EFL context: cultural awareness and language skills. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 16*(3), 1320-1333. Doi: 10.17263/jlls.803748
- Jones, K., & Day, J. D. (1997). Discrimination of two aspects of cognitive-social intelligence from academic intelligence. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 89*(3), 486-497.
- Kanjananiyot, P. (2019). *Internationalization at home*. Thailand - United States Educational Foundation.
- Knight, J. (2004). Internationalization remodeled: Definition, approaches, and rationales. *Journal of studies in international education, 8*(1), 5-31.
- Kural, F. (2020). Long term effects of intercultural competence development training for study-abroad adjustment and global communication. *Journal of Language and Linguistic Studies, 16*(2), 948-958. Doi: 10.17263/jlls.759348
- Larke, N. H. (2007). Award for Distinguished Senior Career Contributions to Psychology in the Public Interest. *The American Psychologist, 62*(8), 800-802.
- Livermore, D. A. (2011). *The cultural Intelligence Difference: Master The One Skill You Can't Do Without in Today's Global Economy*. New York: American.
- Lustig, M. W., & Koester, J. (2003). *Intercultural competence: Interpersonal communication across cultures*. Boston: Pearson Education.
- Marlowe, H. A. (1986). Social intelligence: Evidence for multidimensionality and construct independence. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 78*(1), 52-58.
- Mayer, J. D., & Salovey, P. (1993). The intelligence of emotional intelligence. *Intelligence, 17*, 433-442.
- Phawacharoenphol, P. (2016). *Examination of social intelligence variable groups at Mental health Positive ways of teachers in Office of the Primary Educational Service Area in Prachinburi Province*. Master of Science degree Department of Research and Statistics in Cognitive Science, Burapha University.
- Polit, D. F., & Beck, C. T. (2004). *Nursing research: Principles and methods (7th eds.)*. Philadelphia: Lippincott, Williams, & Wilkins.
- Silvera, D. H., Martinussen, M., & Dahl, T. I. (2001). The Tromsø Social Intelligence Scale, a self-report measure of social intelligence. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology, 42*, 313-319.
- Sternberg, R. J. (2000). *Handbook of intelligence*. New York: Cambridge University press.
- Suriyo, T., Surakarn, A., & Prasertsin, U. (2016). The Developing of Group Counseling Program to Enhance the Social Intelligence for Adolescents at Risk to Depression. *Veridian E-Journal, Silpakorn University, 9*(1), 582-597.
- Thongsueksai, K. (2009). *Development of a Social Intelligence Model for Graduate Students*. Bangkok: Chulalongkorn University.
- Thomas, D. C., & Inkson, K. (2004). *Cultural Intelligence People Skills for Global Business*. Berrett-Koehler: New York.
- Thomas, D. C. (2006). Domain and Development of Cultural Intelligence: The Importance of Mindfulness. *Group and Organization Management, 31*(1), 78-99.
- Thorndike, E. L. (1920). A constant error in psychological ratings. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 4*(1), 25-29.
- Ward, C., & Kennedy, A. (1999). The measurement of sociocultural adaptation. *International Journal of Intercultural Relations, 23*(4), 659-677.

- Varner, I., & Beamer, L. (2010). *Intercultural communication in the global workplace* (5th eds.). Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.
- Waltz, C. F., & Bausell, R. B. (1981). *Nursing research: Design, statistics, and computer analysis*. Philadelphia: F. A. Davis.
- Waltz, C. F., Strickland, O. L., & Lenz, E. R. (2005). *Measurement in nursing and health research* (3rd eds.). New York: Springer Publishing Co.
- Weis, S., & Süß, H. M. (2007). Reviving the search for social intelligence. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 42, 3-14.
- Wong, C. M. T., Day, J. D., Maxwell, S. E., & Meara, N. M. (1995). A multitrait-multimethod study of academic and social intelligence in college students. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 87(1), 117-133.
-

AUTHOR BIODATA

Chaleomkiet Yenphech, is a currently a lecturer at English Program, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Buriram Rajabhat University, Thailand. He obtained his master's degree with high distinction in Teaching English from Ramkhamheang University, Bangkok Metropolis. His research interests include language in factor analysis, classroom contexts, linguistics, and technology-based activities. He has presented papers at international conferences both home and abroad, published articles and papers in various journals.

Kampeeraphab Intanoo, Ph.D. is an assistant professor at English Program, Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, Buriram Rajabhat University, Thailand.