On the relationship between l2 advanced learners' pragmatic competence and their emotional intelligence

Shahla Zeraat Pisheh
State University, Iran.

ABSTRACT

This study strived to show the possible relationship among L2 advanced learners' pragmatic competence and their emotional intelligence. A total of 80 (32 males and 48 females) advanced M.A. TEFL at two Iran's universities participated. Two tests of Bar-On EQ-i and Liu's pragmatic test were administered among the participants. Then, the Pearson product-moment correlation was run. The findings revealed three medium positive correlations (between the participants' pragmatic competence and their intrapersonal/ interpersonal/ emotional intelligence) and two small positive correlations (between the participants' pragmatic competence and adaptability/ stress management intelligence). The overall findings may be revealing to L2 pedagogy on the role of pragmatics and emotional intelligence in the L2 learning development.

© 2014 Elixir All rights reserved.

Introduction

For quite a long time, the mains focus in teaching and learning foreign languages was considered as accuracy in grammatical forms and vocabulary use. After a while, pragmatic competence as the necessary factor in promoting learners' communicative ability (Bachman, 1995) became a suitable substitution for linguistic competence. It is mainly considered to be a fundamental part of individuals' communicative competence (Kasper, 1997). Rose (1999) defined pragmatic competence as a kind of knowledge that enabled people to use the present linguistic knowledge in a suitable form in each context. The development of pragmatic competence is very significant for L2 learners because lack of pragmatic knowledge leads them to misunderstanding or miscommunication (Allami & Naeimi, 2011). Recently, pragmatic competence has become a theme of inquiry (Allami & Naeimi, 2011; Haddadi Koohsar & Gobary Bonab, 2011; Holmes, 1989; Trosberg, 1987). The increasing opportunities in communication have lead researchers to investigate pragmatics and its effect in communication (Nureddeen, 2008).

L2 inquiries during the last few decades relate L2 learning to both affective and cognitive variables so as to specify ability, predict performance, and develop L2 learning and teaching (Ehrman, 2001; Ehrman & Oxford, 1995; Reiff, 1992). Oxford (1990) considered affective variable as one of the main elements of L2 learning which helped L2 learners manage their emotions and motivation. Considering the role of emotions, Mayer and Salovey (1997) defined emotional intelligence as an affective cognitive ability through which a person can perceive, use, and regulate emotion. Many researchers (Finnegan, 1998; Low & Nelson, 2004; Parker, Summerfelt, Hogan, & Majeski, 2004) emphasized on the role of emotional intelligence as a significant predictor of academic success and as the influential factor in L2 learning. As Mayer, Salovey, and Caruso (2000) stated, promotion of emotional intelligence can considerably develop communication between individuals. Consequently, pragmatic competence which is one of the fundamental bases of communication can hypothetically associate with emotional intelligence. Some studies (e.g., Allami & Naeimi, 2011; Mayer, 2001; Mirzaei & Seyyed Rezaei, 2012; Pishgadam, 2007) concern the role of pragmatic competence or emotional intelligence in the educational setting. However, no study, to the best of the present researcher's knowledge, has investigated the relationship between emotional intelligence and pragmatic competence. So the study's aim is to fill this gap and elucidate the issue at hand.

Background

Emotional intelligence is considerably active in promoting the process of L2 learning (Wenden, 1991). It has been investigated by many researchers (Salovey & Mayer, 1990; Goleman, 2001; Bar-On, 1997). Viewing emotional intelligence as a kind of mixed model, Bar-On (1997) introduced it as merging cognitive abilities with personality traits influencing individuals' success (Ciarrochi & Mayer, 2007). He defined emotional intelligence as a series of noncognitive skills, capacities, and abilities that increased an individual power in coping with social problems. His model consisted of five broad areas of skills and some subcategories within each group: intrapersonal abilities (emotional self-awareness, assertiveness, self-regard, self-actualization, independence), interpersonal skills (interpersonal relationships, social responsibility, empathy), adaptability (problem solving, reality testing, flexibility), stress management (stress tolerance, impulse control), and general mood (happiness, optimism). Bar-On (2002) generally believes that emotional intelligence as a means of influencing individual's general intelligence will lead people to great success in life.

In line with Shahmohamadi and Hasanzadeh (2011), intrapersonal scale has a significant role in promoting L2 learners' learning process, and it can be a good predictor of L2 achievement. Intrapersonal intelligence refers to processing an exact picture of oneself and being aware of the inner moods and

Tele:
E-mail addresses: farsiran3@gmail.com

desires (Morgan & Fonseca, 2004). It enables L2 learners to understand the internal features of the self. According to Deutschendorf (2009), knowledge of the inner states enables people to deal with the others and surroundings. Therefore, an awareness of the inner feelings, motivation, and views is in the heart of intrapersonal abilities (Williams & Burden, 1997). Intrapersonal intelligence leads L2 learners to learn the target language better and enables L2 teachers to improve the given teaching method (Littlemore, 2001). Intrapersonal abilities can support L2 learning by tapping into the intrapersonal talents of L2 learners. Intrapersonal skills consist of five subcategories which constitute the inner world of emotional intelligence (Deutschendorf, 2009).

The first subscale of intrapersonal intelligence is emotional self-awareness which informs individuals from their thought, emotions, and stimulations. Awareness of our emotion is necessary for individuals to change other areas of lives. The skill of awareness of emotions is directly dependent on the way people are taught to deal with the emotions (Robbins, 1992). Anthony Robbins (1992, p. 249), in *Awaken the Giant Within*, elucidates the way emotion helps individuals: "the only way to effectively use your emotions is to understand that they all serve you. You must learn from your emotions and use them to create the results you want for a greater quality of life". In line with Bar-On (2002), emotional self-awareness enables individuals to communicate and express their opinions easily through managing their own feelings.

Assertiveness is the second subcategory of intrapersonal intelligence which enables people to assert the emotions, thoughts, and beliefs (Bar-On, 1997). It allows a person to express emotions and presents opinion even though his or her view may run counter to the group ideal (Deutschendorf, 2009). Assertive people should respect others' opinions, rights and limitations. They have different ideas, but they do not try to submit another person; in fact, it is a win/win position (Shimoff, 2008). As Kawamoto (2007) stated, influencing the process of communication, assertive skill is a key component for L2 learners. According to Deutschendorf (2009), the main requirement of assertiveness is the awareness of emotions and a good level of self-regard.

Self-regard is the next subscale of intrapersonal intelligence which enables a person to consider both abilities and disabilities, to see oneself as what he or she is in the real world and to regard both positive and negative points (Bar-On, 1997). According to Deutschendorf (2009), self-regard determines the way people see themselves, their strengths, and weaknesses. Self-regard is directly related to emotional intelligence; consequently, the higher individuals' self-regard, the higher their emotional intelligence and communicative ability (Dong, Aden, Araisa, Armagnac, Cartwright, Domingo, Kemper, & LaMay, 2005).

The fourth subcategory of intrapersonal intelligence is self-actualization which paves the way for a person to reach to the feasible desires through activating one's potentiality (Bar-On, 1997). Self-actualization determines what one has attained during the lifetime compared with what one actually wants to achieve (Deutschendorf, 2009). Psychologist Abraham Maslow defined self-actualization as the illustration of all human features such as deep relationships, a sense of humor, independence, and autonomy. To increase you self-actualization, you should think of the most important things of your life and develop your most basic goals (Carnegie, 1971). In accordance with Adesida, Aina, and Adekunle (2011), the concept of self-actualization inclines people to communicate smoothly.

The last subscale of intrapersonal intelligence is independence. Independent people consult other individuals, but they decide finally (Bar-On, 1997). They always try to direct their own life and destiny. They like to make new decisions and create new way of thinking. They try to consider others' views and use the information provided to them. They are not under the pressure of society; rather, they control their forces and direct them in the right way (Sternberg, 2003). According to Deutschendorf (2009), independence completely corresponds to assertiveness because it allows the individuals to be courageous, ask for what they want, and insist on their wants. Self-management skills are completely evident in the process of independent learning (Vanijdee, 2003). As a result, independent people can manage their emotions in their interactions.

As Bar-On (1997) explicitly explained, interpersonal skills consist of three subscales which are the main contributors of the emotional intelligence outer world (Deutschendorf, 2009). In line with Morgan and Fonseca (2004), interpersonal abilities strongly support L2 learning through understanding other people, working cooperatively, and communicating effectively. That is, it enables individuals to adjust with others, to understand their thoughts, and to learn cooperatively. Cooperative learning can strongly develop interpersonal abilities in the language classrooms. Interpersonal intelligence consists of three subscales of interpersonal relationships, social responsibility, and empathy (Bar-On, 1997).

The first subscale of interpersonal intelligence is interpersonal relationship defined as the ability of creating a relationship with others and maintaining it, the ability of being intimate, and the ability of expressing emotions (Bar-On, 1997). According to Deutschendorf (2009), the emotion is directly related to the quality of relations one forms with others because relationships with others can make the individuals happy or sad. The more significant the relationship, the more time should be spent building the emotional relationship. The interpersonal relationship is completely evident in the heart of social relationship.

The second subcategory of interpersonal intelligence is social responsibility which allows a person to be responsible in social groups, to be helpful in those groups, and to have enough cooperation (Bar-On, 1997). As Goleman (1998) stated, social responsibility meant respecting others' rights and obeying social laws in order to protect the individuals. Sharma (2007) believed that socially responsible individuals have a sense of duty to make their surroundings a better place to live. Such a kind of society is safe and unique for its individuals' contributions and participations (Deutschendorf, 2009).

The last subscale of interpersonal intelligence is empathy that indicates individuals' ability of understanding and recognizing other's emotions and feelings and helping others in difficult situations (Bar-On, 1997). Deutschendorf (2009) believed that empathy enables one to correctly read the others' emotion through guessing people's underlying words and feelings. He asserted that facial expression, posture, force, tone, and other indicators would be useful in understanding others. He noted that a useful way of increasing empathy is the analysis of a conversation in which one is not involved.

Adaptability enables individuals to deal with different changes and solve problems efficiently (Bradshaw, 2008). It is the third category with its three subcategories. The first subcategory is problem solving that Bar-On (1997) defined as the ability in recognizing a problem, defining its areas, and creating effective solutions. The second one is reality testing which consists of understanding the similarities between what

exists in individuals' mind and what happens in the real situation and creating a new situation according to realities (Bar-On, 2002). The last one is flexibility which enables an individual to adjust the feeling, thoughts, and behaviors to the new, hard, and unpredictable conditions (Bar-On, 2002).

The fourth scale is stress management which refers to the ability of controlling stressful situations. Tackling their stresses, individuals can cope with problems and perform better in L2. In line with Pishghadam (2007), there is a strong association between stress management intelligence and L2 academic success. Bar-On (1997) clarified stress management into two subcategories of stress tolerance and impulse control. He defined stress tolerance as the ability of coping with the problems and finding useful solutions in dealing with stress and impulse control as individuals' capacity in controlling their anger, indignation, and feelings in order to reach specific aims. Bar-On (1997) described general mood, the last scale of emotional intelligence, as being both optimistic and enjoying life According to Bar-On (1997), general mood includes happiness and optimism. Happiness is a necessary element of being relaxed and consent of life, and optimism enables one to see the problems positively and hope to life. In accordance with Fahim and Pishghadam (2007), L2 academic success is significantly associated with general mood intelligence in general. Therefore, L2 learners enjoying higher general mood levels may possess more tendencies to learn the target language. Bar-On's Model includes a multidimensional view towards emotional intelligence and considers important individuals' potentiality not their results; in the other words, the process is significant, not the end and consequence (Baltes, 1987). He developed 117-item test based on his five part model which consists of 15 subcategories. Everyone who finds more items in oneself will surely have more level of emotional intelligence. The choices of test are Likert type and are arranged from completely agree to completely disagree. The level of a person's emotional intelligence is completely determined by the achieved grade; for example, one's high grade in optimism shows that he or she is so optimistic. Bar-On's questionnaire is one of the most complete tests for assessing emotional intelligence. According to Bar-On (1997), the questionnaire has the satisfied reliability and validity in different cultures. Therefore, it could be a helpful test for assessing individuals' emotional intelligence. However, Samooei (2002) validated the questionnaire by giving the questionnaire to 18-40 years-old students of state and Azad universities in Esfahan. She reduced the number of items from 117 to 90 because many of items were repetitive.

As Kasper and Blum-Kulka (1993) stated, pragmatics investigates individual's ability in comprehending and producing linguistic action in different context. It studies people's sense of certain texts even when a semantic element has been deleted in the intended text (Blum-Kulka, 1982). In other words, it investigates the factors related to individuals' choice of language in social relationships and the influence of one's choice on others (Bardovi-Harlig, 1992). Pragmatics enables individuals to understand the meaning beyond the words without ambiguity (Bravo & Briz, 2004). It makes a text shorter, more interesting, and more relevant so that the listener or reader will not get tedious from reading or listening a text (Chavarria & Bonany, 2006). Nowadays, pragmatics, as a crucial factor of communication, has a great educational importance. The most important educational value of pragmatics is to be seen in their teachability which enables L2 learners to find socially appropriate language for the selected context (Bardovi-Harlig & Mahan-Taylor, 2003). As Bouton (1988) stated, rules of

pragmatics should be taught to L2 learners because they cannot acquire them on their own. Yamashita (2008) believed that pragmatics was directly related to language users and their problems in the social interaction.

Bachman (1995) considered pragmatic competence as a subcategory of language competence. Pragmatic competence relates linguistic signs to language users and context of communication (Bachman, 1995). He considers pragmatic competence as a framework of knowledge that is used in performance and interpretation of social acts. Kasper (1997) considered pragmatic competence as a subcategory of communicative competence. Considering their pragmatic competence as an organic part of human life, L2 learners can promote their communicative ability and L2 learning. Pragmatic competence is needed for L2 learners because they should be able to recognize the incompatibility between the literal utterance and the intended meaning and then infer the implied meaning by analyzing the literal information (Taguchi, 2010). The development of pragmatic rules is very significant for L2 learners because lack of pragmatic knowledge leads to misunderstanding and miscommunication (Allami & Naeimi, 2011).

Interlanguage pragmatics, related to the realm of SLA, is a subfield of pragmatics and L2 pedagogy (Allwood, 1985). Kasper (1989) defined interlanguage pragmatics as the study of nonnative speakers' use of linguistic-based patterns in an L2. Interlanguage pragmatics investigates L2 learners' use and acquisition of L2 pragmatic knowledge or studies nonnative speakers' use and acquisition of L2 grammatical patterns (Rose, 2000). It investigates nonnative speakers' understanding and production of a target language (Liu, 2006). According to Liu (2006), interlanguage pragmatics refers to the study of L2 pragmatics; in other words, it is the study of how nonnative speakers learn patterns of the target language. It deals with both pragmatic competence and L2 learners' language performance (Ji, 2008). Liu (2004) believed that pragmatics was originally interlanguage pragmatics which investigates nonnative speakers' understanding and production of a target language. He developed a multiple-choice discourse completion test in which the testees were supposed to select the correct choice from the three given options. It assessed the pragmatic knowledge of Chinese EFL learners in relation to the speech act of apology and request.

On the whole, communication is a necessary part of the educational system and is also essential for the promotion of educational processes (Topping, Bermer, & Holmes, 2000). As Mayer, Salovey, and Caruso (2000) stated, promotion of emotional intelligence can considerably develop communication between individuals; consequently, pragmatic competence which is one of the fundamental bases of communication can hypothetically associate with emotional intelligence. Verscheuren (1999) asserted that pragmatics investigated the factors related to one's choice of language in social interaction and also the way that one's choice influences others. Consequently, pragmatics may have an effect on individuals' emotions because one's choice can make another person happy or sad. As a result, the type of the words that one chooses can make the surrounding intimate or not. Furthermore, because pragmatic competence is the main means helping persons to imply the intended and deep meaning of an utterance (Levinson, 1983), L2 teachers being aware of their learners' emotional intelligence levels can make them acquainted with L2 pragmatic competence. Afterward, based upon what has been shown, the following question stand out:

1. Is there any significant association between total Emotional intelligence and its five scales (intrapersonal intelligence, interpersonal intelligence, adaptability, stress management, and general mood) and pragmatic competence among Iranian advanced L2 learners?

Methodology

Participants

For the first phase of the study, Oxford Placement Test (OPT) (Allen, 2004) as a standard language proficiency test with sound validity and reliability was administered to 100 EFL learners. In the second step, a total of 80 EFL advanced learners, 32 males and 48 females, were selected. All of 100 EFL learners were M.A. students, majoring in TEFL from Shahrekord University and Yasuj University.

Instrumentation and Data Collection Procedure

To gather the necessary information, the following materials were used in this study. For the first phase of the study, the OPT created by Allen (2004) was administered to EFL learners so that EFL advanced learners were selected. The Cronbach's alpha for the OPT was calculated; it was 0.83 which revealed a very good internal consistency and reliability. All of the items of OPT were multiple choice which measured EFL learners' grammatical knowledge. As a result, it was a good means to assess the participants' knowledge in terms of proficiency. The OPT test can be used to measure proficiency level of EFL learners (Allen 2004). Allen (2004) determined OPT rating levels chart in which the participants whose scores were between 70-89 out of 100 were considered as proficient advanced users.

To determine the participants' emotional intelligence level, the EQ-i developed by Bar-On (1997) was used. He developed the EQ-i based on his definition of noncognitive skills. He conducted his research over a twelve-year period with more than 6,300 respondents, with 133 items in the form of short sentences measured on a five-point Likert scale (ranging from "strongly agree" to "strongly disagree"). The EQ-i consists of five broad areas of scales and 15 subscales. Bar-On (1997) reported the reliability ranging from 0.69 to 0.86 among samples. This study uses Samooei's (2002) reduction of Bar-On EQ-i into 90 items. Having translated Bar-On EQ-i into Persian, she administered the translated form to 500 students, both males and females, in state and Azad universities in Isfahan. She reported the total reliability of the questionnaire as 0.93. The translated Persian version of the questionnaire is a suitable means of measuring Iranian EFL learners due to its match with Iranian society and culture (Aghayar & Sharifi Daramadi, 2005). In the current study, Cronbach's alpha coefficient was found 0.72. The participants were asked to answer the questionnaire in 40 minutes.

Consequently, a pragmatic test designed to assess the participants' pragmatic knowledge level was administered to the subjects. Liu (2004) developed a multiple-choice pragmatic test to assess the pragmatic knowledge of Chinese EFL learners. He developed the MDCT questionnaire on 57 situations with 24 items each of which has three options. The internal consistency (Cronbach's alpha) of the test was estimated 0.88. In the current study, Cronbach's alpha coefficient was 0.64. Participants were asked to complete Liu's pragmatic test in 20 minutes.

Results

A Pearson product-moment correlation was calculated to see whether there was the relationship between pragmatic competence and emotional intelligence (along with its five scales). Also, prerequisite analyses were run to ensure no violation on the assumptions of normality, linearity, and homoscedasticity. The results of the correlation are depicted in

Table 1: Table Results of the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation for Pragmatic Competence and Emotional Intelligence

	General Mood	Stress Management	Adaptability	Intrapersonal Skill	Interpersonal Skill	Emotional Intelligence
Pragmatic Competence	.194	.253*	.286*	.308*	.327*	.360*
	.085	.024	.010	.005	.003	.001

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

It can be understood from Table 1 that there were three medium positive correlations. The first one is between the L2 advanced learners' pragmatic competence and the intrapersonal skill, r (80) = .308, $p < 0.05$; the second one is between the L2 advanced learners' pragmatic competence and interpersonal skill, r (80) = 0.327, $p < 0.05$; and the last one correlates L2 advanced learners' pragmatic competence and emotional intelligence, r (80) = 0.360, $p < 0.05$. All of these results indicate that the high levels of intrapersonal skill, interpersonal skill, and emotional intelligence correlated with the high scores in the pragmatic test. Furthermore, there were small positive correlations between the L2 advanced learners' pragmatic competence and the stress management, r (80) = 0.253, $p < 0.05$ and the adaptability intelligence, r (80) = 0.286, $p < 0.05$.

Discussion and Conclusion

The results of the correlation between L2 pragmatic competence and emotional intelligence (along with its five subscales) revealed the subsequent associations. There was a small positive correlation between L2 pragmatic competence level and stress management and adaptability. Also, there was a medium positive association between L2 advanced learners' pragmatic competence level and intrapersonal, interpersonal, emotional intelligence. Therefore, the higher the L2 advanced learners' pragmatic competence, the higher their levels of intrapersonal, interpersonal, emotional, stress management, and adaptability intelligence and vice versa.

As the findings of the present study depict, there was a medium positive correlation between the L2 advanced learners' pragmatic competence and intrapersonal intelligence. Therefore, higher levels of intrapersonal characteristics enable the L2 advanced learners to be more pragmatically competent. As Shahtalebi, Sharifi, Saeedian, & Javadi (2011) stated, intrapersonal intelligence has been compatible with learning style. Parker et al. (2004) explained that academic success was strongly associated with several scales of emotional intelligence ordering as intrapersonal ($r = 0.44$), interpersonal ($r = 0.76$ *), stress management ($r = 0.55$ *), and adaptability ($r = 0.67$ *) intelligence. Also, Hashemian and Adibpour (2012) found a strong positive correlation between intrapersonal intelligence and language learning strategies among Iranian L2 learners. They believe that good levels of intrapersonal intelligence enable L2 leaners to be introspective, independent ,and concentrated in the process of L2 leaning. As intrapersonal L2 learners can determine their personal goals and work well with their aims, they know themselves and their feelings very well; consequently, they will be more able to express themselves, and understand others. It would lead them to have a better performance in communicating an L2. These L2 learners should apply the rules of pragmatics to communicate more effectively; therefore, they should improve their pragmatic competence to convey their meaning.

Another medium positive correlation was recognized between L2 advanced learners' pragmatic competence and their

interpersonal intelligence level, *r* (80) = 0.327, *p* < 0.05. Consequently, the higher level of L2 learners' interpersonal intelligence would lead to the higher level of L2 learners' pragmatic competence and vice versa. Interpersonal intelligence enables an individual to sense another person's moods, feelings, motivations, and intentions, and to respond effectively to the others in some pragmatically acceptable way. That is, one should use certain speech acts to influence others and to convince them to pursue him or her (Weinreich-Haste, 1985). Therefore, interpersonal intelligence can contribute to improve L2 learners' pragmatic competence in the process of communication. As Kagan (2000) stated, interpersonal intelligence is the ability to understand, communicate with, interact with, and influence others. On the whole, interpersonally intelligent people have a tendency to interact effectively and to deal with others. This study is in line with Arnold and Fonseca (2004) who found that interpersonal intelligence is strongly connected to learning an L2 because interpersonal frame focuses on the interaction and cooperation of the participants in L2 learning situation. Also, it can be said that a good communicator should possess high pragmatic competence to convey the meaning.

The results also detected a medium positive correlation between the L2 advanced learners' pragmatic competence and their emotional intelligence level, r (80) = 0.360, *p* < 0.05. That is, the higher the L2 learners' pragmatic competences, the higher their emotional intelligence. Strong emotions can either facilitate or block cognitive and affective processes of L2 learning (MacIntyre, Baker, Clément, & Donovan, 2002; Goleman, 1995). Emotions can improve one's ability to think and to solve problems (Goleman, 1995); consequently, L2 leaners can learn an L2 more easily due to the abilities. Researchers show that L2 learners with higher emotional intelligence can be able to make better decisions and to communicate more effectively (Caruso, 2004; Mayer et al., 2000; Pishghadam, 2009); therefore, L2 learners should be pragmatically comptent to have a meaningful communication. This study is in line with Mohammadi (2012) who pointed out that the L2 learners' emotional intelligence scores can be a good predictor of L2 learners' academic achievement. As Pishhadam (2009) stated, L2 leaners' emotional intelligence correlated with their GPA of reading, speaking, writing, and grammar. As a result, emotional intelligence has a fundamental part in L2 academic learning.

A small positive correlation was also found between the L2 advanced learners' pragmatic competence and their stress management level, *r* (80) = 0.253, *p* < 0.05. The capacity to manage stress in the moment is a necessary basis of an effective communication because stress management enables one to think clearly and creatively, and to act appropriately. Accordingly, the higher the L2 learners' pragmatic competence, the higher their stress management intelligence. As a result, L2 learners who managed the stresses might be more pragmatically competent because they could recognize different context stressors and cope with them.

The results of Pearson product-moment correlation proposed a small positive correlation between the L2 advanced learners' pragmatic competence and the adaptability intelligence, *r* (80) = 0.268, *p* < 0.05. That is, the higher the L2 leaners' level of pragmatic competence, the higher their level of adaptability intelligence. An L2 learner should adapt the communication to be appropriate for the others; that is, they should consider factors such as age, culture, and role when adapting the communication to be appropriate for the other

communicators (Fontana, 2014). Pragmatic competence is one of the main components of communication, and it is the ability to express different language functions appropriately (Susikaran. 2013). Consequently, L2 leaners with higher levels of adaptability intelligence would possess higher levels of pragmatic competence. This study is in line with the findings of Parker et a1. (2004) who stated that academic success was associated with adaptability intelligence as a component of emotional intelligence.

Learning an L2 is a popular issue in the world today. It is a complex brain activity which is under the influence of so many factors both internal like age, personality, motivation, and cognition and external factors such as curriculum, instruction, motivation, and context (Shoebottom, 2014). Consequently, cognitive and affective factors play a significant role in L2 learning. That is, cognition and emotion are the two sides of L2 leaning (Brown, 1994). Affective factors are motivation, empathy, stress tolerance, and anxiety, among others (Ehrman, leaver, & Oxford, 2003). By providing L2 learners with affective experiences that meet their needs for emotional basis, L2 teachers can increase their L2 learners' level of emotional intelligence. Moreover, pragmatic competence in L2 must be reasonably well developed to enable an L2 learner to learn L2 language and communicate successfully (Kasper, 1997).

References

Adesida, A., Aina, M. O., & Adekunle, O. O. M. (2011). Communicative competence of learners of English as second language in Nigeria: A case study of federal college of education (F.C.E.) Abeokuta students. *Journal of the Nigeria English Studies Association (JNESA), 2*(14), 61-68.

Aghayar, S., & Sharifi Daramadi, P. (2005). *Emotional intelligence and use of intelligence in emotions.* Tehran: Sepehan Press.

Allami, H., & Naeimi, A. (2011). A cross-linguistic study of refusals: An analysis of pragmatic competence. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *43*, 385-406.

Allen, D. (2004). *The Oxford placement test.* Oxford University Press.

Allwood, J. (1985). Intercultural communication. In J. Allwood (Ed.), Tvärkulturell kommunikation, Papers in Anthropological Linguistics 12. University of Göteborg. English translation by Jens Allwood.

Arnold. J., & Fonseca, M. C. (2004). Multiple intelligence theory and foreign language learning: A brain-based perspective. *International Journal of English Studies*, *4* (1), 119-136.

Bachman, L.F. (1995). *Fundamental consideration in language testing* (3rd ed.). Oxford University Press.

Baltes, P. B. (1987). Theoretical propositions of life-span developmental psychology: On the dynamics between growth and decline. *Developmental Psychology*, *23*, 611-626.

Bardovi-Harlig, K. (1992). Pragmatics as a part of teacher education. *TESOL*, *1* (3), 28-32.

Bardovi-Harlig, K., & Mahan-Taylor, R. (2003). *Teaching Pragmatics*. Washington DC: U.S. Department of State Office of English Language Programs, Retrieved March 10, 2014, from the World Wide Web: http://exchanges.state.gov/education/engteaching/pragmatics.htm

Bar-On, R. (1997). *The emotional quotient inventory (EQ-i): A test of emotional intelligence.* Toronto, Canada: Multi-Health Systems.

Bar-On, R. (2002). *Bar-On emotional quotient inventory (EQ-i): Technical manual.* Toronto, Canada: Multi-Health Systems.

Blum-Kulka, S. (1982). Learning how to say what you mean in a second language: A study of Hebrew as a second language. *Applied Linguistics, 3*, 29-59.

Bouton, L. F. (1988). A cross-cultural study of ability to interpret implicatures in English. *World Englishes, 17*, 183-196.

Bradshaw, F. B. (2008). *Exploring the relationship between emotional intelligence and academic achievement in African American female college students.* Unpublished Doctoral dissertation. Retrieved from ProQuest database. (3304794).

Bravo, D., & Briz, A. (Eds.) (2004). *Sociocultural pragmatics: Studies on politeness discourse in Spanish.* Barcelona: Ariel Linguistica.

Brown, D. (1994). *Principles of language learning and teaching* (3rd Edition). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Carnegie, D. (1971). *How to win friend and influence people.* New York: Simon & Schuster.

Caruso, D. R. (2004). *The emotionally intelligent manager: How to develop and use the four key emotional skills of leadership.* San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Chavarria, M. L., & Bonany, E. B. (2006). Raising awareness of pragmatics in the EFL classroom: A proposal. *Culture, Language and Representation. 3*, 133-144.

Ciarrochi, J., & Mayer, J. D. (Eds.) (2007). *Applying emotional intelligence: A practitioner's guide.* New York: Psychology Press.

Deutschendorf, H. (2009). *The other kind of smart: Simple ways to boost your emotional intelligence for greater personal effectiveness and success.* New York: American Management Association.

Dong, Q., Aden, T., Araisa, S., Armagnac, W., Cartwright, P., Domingo, B., Kemper, M., & LaMay, B. (2005). *The impact of self-esteem and media information seeking on EI.* Paper presented at the International Communication Association Conference, New York City, New York.

Ehrman, M. E., Leaver, B. L., & Oxford, R. L. (2003). A brief overview of individual differences in second language learning. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences, 31*(3), 313-330.

Ehrman, M., & Oxford, R. L. (1995). Cognition plus: Correlates of adult language proficiency. *The Modern Language Journal, 79*(1), 67-89.

Ehrman, M.E. (2001). Bringing learning strategies to the learner: The FSI language learning consultation service. In J.E. Alatis & A.Tan (Eds.), *Language in our time: Bilingual education and official English, ebonics and Standard English, immigration and the unz initiative* (pp.41-58). Washington DC: Georgetown University.

Fahim, M., & Pishghadam, R. (2007). On the role of emotional, psychometric, and verbal intelligences in the academic achievement of university students majoring in English language. *Asian EFL Journal, 9*, 240-253.

Finnegan, J. E. (1998). *Measuring emotional intelligence: Where we are today.* Montgomery: Anbum University of Montgomery, School of Education.

Fontana, P. (2014). The importance of adaptability in communication. Retrieved January 11, 2014, from the World Wide Web: http://yourbusiness.azcentral.com/importance-adaptability-communication-10118.html

Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ.* New York: Bantam Books

Goleman, D. (1998). *Working with emotional intelligence.* New York: Bantam Books.

Goleman, D. (2001). Emotional intelligence: Issues in paradigm building. In C. Cherniss & D. Goleman (Eds.), *The emotionally intelligence workplace* (pp. 3-26). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Haddadi Koohsar, A.A., & Ghobary Bonab, B. (2011). Relation between emotional intelligence and quality of attachment in high school administrators. *Pocedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences, 30*, 949-953.

Hashemian, M., & Adibour, M. (2012). Relationship between Iranian L2 learners' multiple intelligences and language learning strategies. *RALS, 3* (1), 25-43.

Holmes, J. (1989). Sex differences and apologies: One aspect of communicative competence. *Applied Linguistics, 10*(2), 194-213.

Ji, P. (2008). *Pragmatics and pedagogy in college English teaching.* Shanghai Foreign Language Educauion Press.

Kagan, S. (2000). *Multiple intelligence and second language learning.* New York: National Professional Resources.

Kasper, G. (1989). Variation in interlanguage speech act realization. In S. Gass, C. Madden, D. Preston, & L. Selinker (Eds.), *Variation in second language acquisition: Discourse and pragmatics* (pp.37-58). Clevedon and Philadelphia: Multilingual Matters.

Kasper, G. (1997). Can pragmatic competence be taught? *Second Language Teaching and Curriculum Center, 7*, 21-39.

Kasper, G., & Blum-Kulka, S. (Eds.) (1993). *Interlanguage pragmatics.* Oxford University Press.

Kawamoto, F. (2007). Assertive communication in Japanese English learners. *Jiyugaoka Sanno College Bulletin, 1*(9), 57-64.

Levinson, S. C. (1983). *Pragmatics.* Cambridge University Press.

Littlemore, J. (2001). Metaphoric intelligence and foreign language learning. *Humanising Language Teaching, 3*(2), 1-18.

Liu, J. (2004). *Measuring interlanguage pragmatic knowledge of Chinese EFL learners.* Unpublished doctoral dissertation, City University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong, China.

Liu, J. (2006). Assessing EFL learners' interlanguage pragmatic knowledge: Implications for testers and teachers. Retrieved August 13, 2014, from the World Wide Web: http://www.nus.edu.sg/celc/publications/liu Vo15.pdf

Low, G. R., & Nelson, D.A. (2004). Emotional intelligence: Effectively bridging the gap between high school and college. *Texas Study Magazine for Secondary Education,* Spring Edition.

MacIntyre, P. D., Baker, S. C., Clément, R., & Donovan, L. A. (2002). Sex and age effects on willingness to communicate, anxiety, perceived competence, and L2 motivation among junior high school French immersion students. *Language Learning, 52*(3), 537-564.

Mayer, J. D. (2001). A field guide to emotional intelligence. In J. Ciarrochi, J. Forgas, & J. Mayer (Eds.), *Emotional intelligence in everyday life: A scientific inquiry* (pp. 3-24). New York: Psychology Press.

Mayer, J. D., Salovey, P., & Caruso, D. (2000). Emotional intelligence as zeitgeist, as personality, and as mental ability. In R. Bar-On & D. A. Parker (Eds.), *The handbook of emotional intelligence* (pp. 92-117). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Mayer, J., & Salovey, P. (1997). *What is emotional intelligence?* New York: Basic Book.

Mirzaei, A., & Seyyed Rezaei, M. (2012). Exploring the underrepresentation of pragmatic competence in the L2 classrooms in Iran. *Social Sciences and Humanity Studies. 4* (1), 1309-8063.

Mohammadi, M. (2012). The role of emotional intelligence on English learning as a second language. *International Research Journal of Applied and Basic Sciences. 3*(9), 1953-1956.

Morgan, J. A., & Fonseca, M. C. (2004). Multiple intelligence theory and foreign language learning: A brain-based perspective. *International Journal of English Studies, 4*(1), 119-136.

Nureddeen, F.A. (2008). Cross cultural pragmatics: Apology strategies in Sudanese Arabic. *Journal of Pragmatics*, *40*, 279-306.

Oxford, R.L. (1990). *Language learning strategies: What every teacher should know*. Boston: Heinle & Heinle.

Parker, J. D. A., Summerfeldt, L. J., Hogan, M. J., & Majeski, S. (2004). EI and academic success: Examining the transition from high school to university. *Personality and Individual Differences, 36*, 163-172.Pishghadam, R. (2007). *On the influence of emotional and verbal intelligence on second language learning*. Unpublished doctoral dissertation, Allameh Tabataba'i University, Tehran, Iran.

Pishghadam, R. (2009). A quantitative analysis of the relationship between emotional intelligence and foreign language learning. *Electronic journal of foreign language teaching*, *6*(1), 31-41.

Reiff, J. (1992). *Learning styles: What research says to the teacher?* Washington, DC: National Education Assn.

Robbins, A. (1992). *Awaken the giant within*. New York: Free Press.

Rose, K. (1999). Teachers and students learning about requests in Hong Kong. In E. Hinkel (Ed.), *Culture in Second Language Teaching and Learning* (pp. 167-180). Cambridge University Press.

Rose, K. (2000). An exploratory cross-sectional study of interlanguage pragmatic development. *Studies in Second Language Acquisition, 22*, 27–67.

Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. D. (1990). Emotional intelligence. *Imagination, Cognition, and Personality, 9*(3), 185-211.

Samooei, R. (2002). *EI inventory*. Tehran: Ravan Tajhiz Sina.

Shahmohamadi, F., & Hasanzadeh, R. (2011). EI and its predictive power in Iranian foreign language learners' language achievement. *IPEDR, 5*(2), 1-5.

Shahtalebi, B., Sharifi, S., Saeedian, V., & Javadi, H. (2011). Examining the relationship between emotional intelligence and learning styles. *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *31*, 95-99.

Sharma, R. (2007). *Greatness guide book 2*. New York: Harper Collins.

Shimoff, M. (2008). *Happy for no reason: 7 steps to being happy from the inside out*. New York: Free Press.

Shoebottom, P. (2014). The factors that influence the acquisition of a second language. Retrieved March 5, 2014, from the World Wide Web: http://esl.fis.edu/teachers/support/factors.htm

Sternberg, R. (2003). *Successful intelligence*. New York: Simon & Schuster.

Susikaran, R. S. A. (2013). Towards developing pragmatic competence. *The Criterion: An International Journal in English*, 12, 1-8.

Taguchi, N. (2010). Longitudinal studies in interlanguage pragmatics. In A. Trosborg (Ed.), *Pragmatics across languages and cultures* (pp. 333-362). Berlin: Mouton de Gruyter.

Topping, K., Bremner, W., & Holmes, E. A. (2000). Social competence: The social construction of the concept. In R, Bar-On & D. A. Parker (Eds). *The handbook of emotional intelligence: Theory, development, assessment and application at home, school and in the workplace* (pp. 28-39). California: Jossey-Bass.

Trosberg, A. (1987). Apology strategies in natives/non-natives. *Journal of Pragmatics, 11*, 147-167.

Vanijdee, A. (2003). Thai distance English learners and learner autonomy. *Open Learning, 18*(1), 75-84.

Verscheuren, J. (1999). *Understanding Pragmatics*. University of Pennsylvania.

Weinreich-Haste, H. (1985). The varieties of intelligence: An interview with Howard Gardner. *New Ideas in Psychology, 3*(4), 47-65.

Wenden, A. (1991). *Learner strategies for learner autonomy: Planning and implementing learner training for language learners.* Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Williams, M., & R. Burden. (1997). *Psychology for language teachers*. Cambridge University Press.

Yamashita, S. (2008). Investigating interlanguage pragmatic ability: What are we testing? In E. A. Soler & A. Martínez-Flor, *investigating pragmatics in foreign language learning, teaching and testing* (pp.201-223). Great Britain: Cromwell Press.