

**Social Intelligence and Its Relation to Organizational
Citizenship Behaviors in the University Setting
A Field Study of Female Faculty Administrators at
the University of Biskra**

Dr. Iman Noui¹,

1- Mohamed Khider University of Biskra

Laboratory of Social Change and Public Relations in Algeria -
Biskra,

Email: iman.noui@univ-biskra.dz

Received: 29 /06 /2025; Accepted: 10/ 09 /2025 -

Abstract:

This study examined the relationship between the level of social intelligence and organizational citizenship behaviors (OCB) among female faculty administrators at the University of Biskra. A descriptive design was adopted as appropriate to the research problem. The researcher relied on a purposive sample of 47 female academic administrators. Data were collected by questionnaire comprising two instruments: a social intelligence scale and an OCB scale.

The findings indicated that:

1. The study sample exhibits a high level of social intelligence.
2. There are no statistically significant differences in social intelligence attributable to years of administrative service within the sample.
3. The level of organizational citizenship behaviors is high in the sample.
4. There are no statistically significant differences in OCB attributable to years of administrative service.
5. There is a positive correlation between social intelligence and OCB among female academic administrators at the University of Biskra.

ISSN: 1112- 7872
E-ISSN: 2600-6162

pp.620-654

Almawaqif: Journal of sociological and historical
Studies

Vol. 210N°01 , Month 11 Year 2025

Title Social Intelligence and Its Relation
to Organizational Citizenship Behaviors
in the University Setting

Keywords: Social Intelligence, Organizational Citizenship Behaviors, Tact, Social Awareness, Female Faculty Administrators.

Iman Noui,
e-mail: iman.noui@univ-biskra.dz

المواقف

المجلد 21، العدد 01 الشهر 11
السنة 2025

الذكاء الاجتماعي وعلاقته بسلوكيات المواطنة التنظيمية في المؤسسة الجامعية

دراسة ميدانية على عينة من الأساتذات الجامعيات الإداريات بجامعة بسكرة

الدكتورة :إيمان نوي¹،

جامعة محمد خيضر بسكرة مخبر التغير الاجتماعي والعلاقات العامة في الجزائر -
بسكرة-

الملخص: هدفت هذه الدراسة الى البحث في طبيعة العلاقة بين مستوى الذكاء الاجتماعي وسلوكات المواطنة التنظيمية لدى الأستاذة الجامعية الإدارية بجامعة بسكرة ، ولتحقيق أهداف هذه الدراسة استخدمت الباحثة المنهج الوصفي لمناسبته للموضوع محل الدراسة و استعانت بعينة قدرها 47 أستاذة جامعية إدارية تم اختيارها بالطريقة القصدية ، كما اعتمدت الاستبيان كأداة لجمع البيانات الميدانية مكون من مقياسين مقياس خاص بالذكاء الاجتماعي ومقياس سلوكيات المواطنة التنظيمية . وقد بينت نتائج الدراسة : ان مستوى الذكاء الاجتماعي لدى عينة الدراسة مرتفع- . أنه لا توجد فروق ذات دلالة إحصائية في مستوى الذكاء الاجتماعي تعزى لمتغير سنوات الخدمة في الإدارة لدى عينة الدراسة- . ان مستوى سلوكات المواطنة التنظيمية مرتفع لدى عينة الدراسة- . أنه لا توجد فروق ذات دلالة في مستوى سلوكات المواطنة التنظيمية تعزى لمتغير سنوات الخدمة في

الإدارة- . أنه توجد علاقة ارتباطية موجبة بين مستوى الذكاء الاجتماعي و سلوكات المواطننة التنظيمية لدى الأستاذة الجامعية الإدارية بجامعة بكرة.

الكلمات المفتاحية: الذكاء الاجتماعي ، سلوكات المواطننة التنظيمية ، الكياسة ، الوعي الاجتماعي ، الأستاذة الجامعية الإدارية.

Introduction

Amid the accelerating transformations that characterize today's work environment, universities stand out as dynamic arenas whose mandate extends beyond teaching and research to the cultivation of human capital capable of adaptation and meaningful contribution. Fulfilling an institution's mission therefore requires faculty performance that transcends routine duties and incorporates voluntary, constructive actions referred to as Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCB). Altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, and courtesy represent core dimensions of OCB; collectively, they bolster an organization's overall effectiveness and efficiency.

These positive behaviors arise from a constellation of individual and organizational factors. Social intelligence occupies a central place among them. Defined as the capacity to comprehend and regulate social relationships while interacting effectively with others, social intelligence comprises social awareness, empathy, and relationship-management skills. Within a university—where interactions

المواقف

المجلد ، العدد ، الشهر
السنة

among faculty, administrators, and students are densely woven—social intelligence facilitates constructive engagement, trust-building, and collaboration.

In this setting, the female faculty administrator plays an active, indispensable role. Her responsibilities span teaching, research, and administrative duties, each demanding specialized interpersonal competence for dealing with colleagues, students, and senior management. Social intelligence, as a personal resource, equips her to navigate social interactions successfully, thereby shaping behavior across the institution.

Conversely, OCB constitutes a pivotal foundation for institutional success, particularly in academia. These behaviors exceed formal job descriptions, encompassing discretionary acts that support both the organization and one's colleagues—helping others, adhering to institutional rules, and initiating improvements in performance, for example. When widespread, such behaviors enhance work efficiency, cultivate a positive climate, and promote the attainment of strategic goals.

Given the scarcity of studies on social intelligence and OCB among female academic administrators, the present inquiry is both timely and necessary. It seeks to answer the overarching question:

- What is the relationship between the level of social intelligence and organizational citizenship behaviors among female faculty administrators at the University of Biskra?

1. Sub Questions

- What is the level of social intelligence among female academic administrators at Mohamed Khider University of Biskra?
- Are there statistically significant differences in social-intelligence levels attributable to years of administrative service?
- What is the level of organizational citizenship behaviors among these administrators?
- Are there statistically significant differences in organizational-citizenship behaviors attributable to years of administrative service?

2. Research Hypotheses

- **General Hypothesis:** A statistically significant relationship exists between social-intelligence level and organizational-citizenship behaviors among female academic administrators at the University of Biskra.
- **Sub-Hypotheses**
 - Social-intelligence levels among female academic administrators at Mohamed Khider University of Biskra are high.
 - There are statistically significant differences in social-intelligence levels attributable to years of administrative service.
 - Organizational-citizenship behavior levels among these administrators are high.

- There are statistically significant differences in organizational-citizenship behaviors attributable to years of administrative service.

3. Objectives

- Assess the level of social intelligence among female academic administrators at Mohamed Khider University of Biskra.
- Determine the nature of the relationship between social-intelligence level and organizational-citizenship behaviors within this population.
- Measure organizational-citizenship behaviors among female academic administrators at the same institution.
- Identify any differences in social-intelligence levels and organizational-citizenship behaviors associated with years of administrative service.

4. Research Significance

- **Theoretical Significance:** The study enriches the literature on social intelligence and organizational-citizenship behaviors by exploring their interaction in a university context—an area that remains under-examined, particularly with respect to female academic administrators.
- **Practical Significance:** Findings can guide universities in designing training programs aimed at developing employees' social-intelligence competencies. Moreover, understanding the determinants of OCB will enable university leadership to foster these positive behaviors, thereby advancing institutional goals and

enhancing performance. Ultimately, the study highlights social intelligence as a potential lever for improving organizational effectiveness and creating a more positive, productive work environment.

Operational Definitions

Social Intelligence

Social intelligence refers to an individual's capacity to discern and interpret others' psychological states, motives, desires, intentions, and emotions, and to respond appropriately. In the present study, it comprises four dimensions: (1) social awareness, (2) social self-efficacy, (3) social empathy, and (4) social problem-solving.

Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCB)

OCB denotes discretionary actions that lie outside formal job duties yet advance the university's strategic interests. Two broad forms can be distinguished.

1. **Proactive contribution.** Examples include assisting colleagues, offering creative suggestions to improve performance, and avoiding time wastage.
2. **Quality of restraint.** The administrator voluntarily refrains from conduct that, although permissible, would undermine workplace harmony—for instance, fault-finding in others' work or overreacting to minor frictions.

Female Faculty Administrator

The term designates any permanent female faculty member at Mohamed Khider University of Biskra who

occupies an administrative post such as vice-dean, department head, assistant department head, or program coordinator.

Theoretical Framework:

1. Social Intelligence

Abd al-Salam Zahran defines social intelligence as an individual's capacity to perceive social relationships, understand others, interact appropriately, and manage social situations in ways that secure adjustment and success within society (Zahran, 1984, p. 225).

The Encyclopedia of Psychology (1977) defines the construct as "that form of intelligence exhibited in an individual's dealings with others and in the conduct of social relations." High social intelligence is equated with tact and social adroitness, namely, the ability to adapt to one's social milieu and deal effectively with new relational demands (al-Desouki, 2008, p. 83).

A further formulation presents social intelligence as the ability to detect and comprehend others' psychological states, moods, motives, desires, intentions, and emotions, to discriminate among them, and to respond appropriately. Sensitivity to facial expression, vocal tone, and gesture is integral. The quality is readily observed in effective teachers, social workers, and politicians. In some sources, the same construct appears under "inter-personal intelligence," that is, the aptitude for recognizing others' moods, intentions, and feelings, together with sensitivity to non-verbal cues (Abu-Riyash et al., 2006, p. 228).

Marlowe conceives social intelligence as comprising two broad constituents:

1. **Social Performance:** This denotes the individual's actual behavior in social settings, typically oriented toward mutual benefit.
2. **Social Competence:** This refers to a person's underlying capacity to deal with others in an appropriate and effective manner. Marlowe partitions social competence into three elements:
 - **Social Self-Efficacy:** A sense of confidence and mastery in social interaction.
 - **Social Skills:** Encompassing both behavioral techniques and declarative social knowledge.
 - **Social Interest:** The motivational dimension that directs behavior toward social goals and reflects a person's concern for, and perceived regard by, others.

Karl Albrecht (2006, p. 55) proposes five interconnected elements of social intelligence:

1. **Situational perception and awareness:** Sensitivity to others' feelings, intentions, and unspoken cues in a given social setting.
2. **Presence:** The manner in which one influences others through communication and the impressions one leaves, thereby expanding future social-intelligence capacity.

3. **Authenticity:** Consistency and credibility with oneself and with others; it presupposes the avoidance of flattery and fosters trust through mutually respectful conduct.
4. **Clarity:** The ability to state ideas, intentions, and opinions openly and without hesitation, in other words, to say what one means and mean what one says.
5. **Understanding and empathy:** A positive, affective grasp of others' viewpoints and emotions that underpins genuine empathic engagement.

Scholarly perspectives on social intelligence vary, reflecting distinct theoretical and disciplinary lenses; some authors present full theories, whereas others offer dimensional models that capture specific manifestations of the construct (Abu Halawa, 2005, p. 21).

One notable measurement tool influenced by Thorndike's ideas—and designed to overcome his reservations about earlier psychometric approaches—is the George Washington University Social Intelligence Test by Moss and Hunt, later adapted by Omwake and Woodward. A concise Arabic version appeared in 1955, translated by Muhammad Imad al-Din Ismail and Sayed Abd al-Hamid Morsi; the full original was re-translated by Derini Hussein Abd al-Aziz in 1998. The instrument comprises four abilities:

1. Judging social situations, that is, analysing problems in interpersonal relations and selecting optimal solutions (verbal sub-test).
2. Inferring a speaker's psychological state from verbal statements (verbal sub-test).

3. Recalling names and faces (picture sub-test).
4. Observing human behaviour and applying that experience to interpret future actions (verbal sub-test). A fifth facet, sense of humour and playfulness, gauges the individual's appreciation of jokes (Moghazy, 2003, p. 88).

A range of developmental factors nurture social intelligence:

- **Socialisation:** The lifelong learning process whereby individuals acquire behaviours, norms, and attitudes suited to particular social roles, enabling them to integrate into their community. Effective socialisation allows a person to internalise language, customs, and shared values, thereby sustaining cultural continuity and facilitating social adjustment (Zahran, 2000, p. 243). Poorly guided socialisation, by contrast, may yield maladaptive social conduct.
- **Social interaction:** Continuous interaction underpins human social life; individual behaviour emerges from expectations formed—and adjusted—in response to others' actions. Interaction not only shapes personality but also serves as a conduit for transmitting values, habits, and attitudes, helping individuals satisfy psychological needs and achieve interpersonal congruence. Greater facility in social interaction typically improves a person's capacity to anticipate others' viewpoints (Khalidi, 2009, p. 34).

Flexibility in Interpersonal Conduct

Flexibility in dealing with others inclines an individual toward adaptive change, relying on evidence and logical justification when confronting social situations to fulfil assigned tasks. Such adaptability nurtures social intelligence. Levine observes that habits acquired in daily life evolve in tandem with changing social contexts.

Acceptance

A person's perception of others determines the degree of social acceptance reflected in the formation of relationships, understanding and empathising with others, cultivating mutual affection, and attending to their comfort and happiness (Muntaha, 2011, p. 204).

Definition of Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) refers to discretionary conduct performed by employees voluntarily, without coercion and without the expectation of material reward, yet which contributes to the efficiency and vitality of the institution.

Al Jawish, cited in Al Qahtani (2016, p. 24), defines it as behavior adopted willingly and out of personal satisfaction, free of compulsion and detached from the anticipation of financial compensation.

Zaidan frames it as "conscientious behavior," meaning achievement guided by moral obligation. In his view, OCB represents optional extra-role activities, such as providing assistance to colleagues, supporting the organization as a whole, and enhancing its image before outsiders or competitors. Such actions are performed without the threat of

punishment, and when carried out regularly, they contribute to organizational welfare.

Jaha Njiru and colleagues similarly conceptualize OCB as discretionary behavior at the workplace that extends beyond the individual's formal job requirements, a form of conduct that surpasses the call of duty and is not explicitly recognized within the formal reward system.

Al Sahimat emphasizes its cooperative dimension, defining OCB as the behaviors and practices of employees that sustain institutional effectiveness and drive its activities forward through human collaboration (Al Sahimat, p. 40).

Characteristics of Organizational Citizenship Behavior

From these definitions, a set of core characteristics can be identified. OCB involves behaviors that go beyond formal duties and job obligations, exceeding what is explicitly prescribed in official job descriptions. It is essentially voluntary, self-motivated, and intentional, emerging from the free will of the employee rather than from organizational compulsion.

The concept also encompasses both active contributions and voluntary restraint. On the one hand, it includes positive initiatives such as helping co-workers, proposing innovative ideas to improve performance, and avoiding time wastage. On the other hand, it covers the conscious avoidance of negative practices, such as fault-finding or escalating minor workplace disputes, which is often referred to as the *quality of restraint*.

OCB is not formally tied to contractual obligations and does not yield immediate or direct benefits for the individual. However, employees often expect that their discretionary conduct will be valued in future competitive contexts, potentially providing a reputational or strategic advantage. Importantly, OCB is not a single action but a cluster of behaviors whose form varies across organizations and societies depending on institutional rules and cultural norms distinguishing formal requirements from voluntary contributions.

Ultimately, OCB reflects employees' loyalty and their strong commitment to remain within the organization and contribute to its progress. Its overall orientation is positive, in that it supports the achievement of organizational objectives and is perceived favorably by observers (Al Qahtani, 2016, p. 45).

Dimensions of Organizational Citizenship Behavior

Altruism: A voluntary, extra-role tendency to assist colleagues with work-related difficulties. It includes helping co-workers solve job problems, orienting and guiding new employees in performing specific tasks, and covering for absent staff to clear accumulated work.

Courtesy (tact, politeness): The individual's effort to prevent work-related problems by anticipating their effects on others, recognizing how one's behavior impacts co-workers, refraining from encroaching on others' rights, and avoiding the initiation of interpersonal conflict (Braf, 2007, p. 246).

Conscientiousness: Acting in accordance with an internal moral sense and personal ideals, thereby performing

one's role at a level that exceeds formal requirements. Typical manifestations include exemplary attendance, strict compliance with rules and regulations, and sustained diligence beyond minimum job standards.

Sportsmanship: Willingness to tolerate temporary or minor inconveniences without complaint or resistance. It reflects patience, forbearance, and acceptance of routine hassles at work without grumbling or perceiving injustice.

Civic virtue: Constructive, responsible participation in the governance and life of the organization. It entails attending important formal and informal meetings, staying informed about organizational change, reading memos and announcements, and executing one's duties in ways that preserve and enhance the organization's reputation (Shalabi and Shekhawi, 2020, pp. 20–21).

Field Study

1. Study Delimitations

1.1 Spatial delimitation. The fieldwork was conducted at Mohamed Khider University of Biskra across three sites: the Chetma campus, the Central/El Alia campus, and the El Hadjeb campus.

1.2 Temporal delimitation: The field phase extended from 10/10/2024 to 19/02/2025. During this period, the researchers engaged a group of female faculty members working in administration, including a department head, a program coordinator, a vice head of department, and a vice dean.

2. Methodological approach: The study employed a descriptive, analytically oriented design. This choice aligns with the study's aim to observe and describe the phenomenon under investigation through a systematic procedure for collecting information to characterise it. In this approach, variables are examined as they exist in their natural settings in order to identify relationships that may arise among them (Ubaydat et al., 2001, p. 355).

3. Sample: The study drew on a purposive sample of 47 female academic administrators at the University of Biskra. A census was not feasible because a substantial number of potential participants declined to complete the questionnaire.

4. Data gathering Tools: Two instruments were used: a Social Intelligence Scale and an Organizational Citizenship Behaviors Scale.

5. Psychometric Validity for both scales (social intelligence; organizational citizenship behaviors):

Content validity by expert review: The researcher submitted both instruments to a panel of university professors specialising in organizational sociology to judge item clarity, relevance to the target population, and alignment with the intended dimensions. The panel also assessed the suitability of the items for measuring social intelligence and organizational citizenship behaviors among female academic administrators, recommending revisions or additions to enhance quality. Items that failed to achieve an 80 percent agreement threshold (8 of 9 raters) were not retained.

6. Final form of the instruments. The Social Intelligence Scale comprised 39 items in its final version.

The Organizational Citizenship Behaviors Scale comprised 24 items in its final version.

Table (1) Dimensions and Items of the Final Social Intelligence and Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scales

Dimensions of the Social Intelligence Scale	Item Numbers	Dimensions of the Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale	Item Numbers
Social Awareness	1-6-11-10-16-21-26-31-35	Courtesy	1-4-13-16-19-22
Social Self-Efficacy	2-7-12-15-17-22-27-32-37	Altruism	2-5-8-11-20-23
Social Empathy	3-8-13-20-18-23-28-33-38	Sportsmanship	3-6-9-12-15-18
Social Problem Solving	4-9-14-19-25-24-29-34-39	Conscientiousness	7-10-14-17-21-24
Total Items	39 items		24 items

Internal Consistency Validity:

Anastasi distinguishes between two item-level considerations—reliability and validity—and notes that internal consistency is conceptually nearer to validity, particularly construct validity, than to mere reliability. In her view, a scale primarily gauges the homogeneity that links each item to the overall score. This homogeneity is typically estimated with a Pearson correlation when items are continuous, or a point-biserial correlation when responses are dichotomous (yes/no or true/false). Anastasi concedes that,

although internal consistency offers useful evidence, its contribution to test validation remains limited; ultimately, one must turn to external criteria to establish a measure's validity in any rigorous sense.

Table (2): Correlation Coefficients of Each Item with Its Measured Dimension and the Total Scale Score (n = 47)

No.	Correlation Coefficients				No.	Correlation Coefficients			
	With Dimension		With Total Score			With Dimension		With Total Score	
	R	Sig	R	Sig		R	Sig	R	Sig
Organizational Citizenship Behaviors						Social Intelligence			
1	0.752	0.01	0.488	0.01	1	0.651	0.01	0.482	0.01
2	0.573	0.01	0.480	0.01	2	0.689	0.01	0.503	0.01
3	0.610	0.01	0.493	0.01	3	0.384	0.05	0.301	0.05
4	0.522	0.01	0.473	0.01	4	0.713	0.01	0.553	0.01
5	0.575	0.01	0.464	0.01	5	0.795	0.01	0.623	0.01
6	0.384	0.05	0.371	0.05	6	0.662	0.01	0.554	0.01
7	0.591	0.01	0.454	0.01	7	0.258	Not Sig	0.101	Not Sig
8	0.710	0.01	0.459	0.01	8	0.735	0.01	0.517	0.01
9	0.661	0.01	0.500	0.01	9	0.662	0.01	0.500	0.01
10	0.505	0.01	0.432	0.05	10	0.777	0.01	0.505	0.01
11	0.353	0.05	0.393	0.05	11	0.565	0.01	0.355	0.05
12	0.680	0.01	0.594	0.01	12	0.711	0.01	0.477	0.01
13	0.788	0.01	0.544	0.01	13	0.666	0.01	0.483	0.01
14	0.709	0.01	0.500	0.01	14	0.599	0.01	0.470	0.01
15	0.743	0.01	0.512	0.01	15				
16	0.555	0.01	0.498	0.01	16	0.654	0.01	0.457	0.01
17	0.695	0.01	0.531	0.01	17	0.800	0.01	0.681	0.01

18	0.205	Not Sig	0.123	Not Sig	18	0.731	0.01	0.574	0.01
19	0.661	0.01	0.497	0.01	19	0.497	0.01	0.393	0.05
20	0.639	0.01	0.460	0.01	20	0.663	0.01	0.507	0.01
21	0.561	0.01	0.449	0.01	21	0.788	0.01	0.567	0.01
22	0.673	0.01	0.588	0.01	22	0.719	0.01	0.464	0.01
23	0.733	0.01	0.499	0.01	23	0.663	0.01	0.489	0.01
24	0.803	0.01	0.629	0.01	24	0.559	0.01	0.495	0.01
					25	0.740	0.01	0.510	0.01
					26	0.667	0.01	0.476	0.01
					27	0.219	Not Sig	0.200	Not Sig
					28	0.711	0.01	0.502	0.01
					29	0.664	0.01	0.490	0.01
					30	0.450	0.01	0.399	0.05
					31	0.662	0.01	0.470	0.01
					32	0.649	0.01	0.530	0.01
					33	0.656	0.01	0.446	0.01
					34	0.782	0.01	0.478	0.01
					35	0.695	0.01	0.523	0.05
					36	0.607	0.01	0.544	0.01
					37	0.688	0.01	0.520	0.01
					38	0.803	0.01	0.731	0.01
					39	0.714	0.01	0.61	0.01

Table 2 shows that item 18 on the organizational-citizenship scale, together with items 7 and 27 on the social-intelligence scale, failed to reach statistical significance; the researcher therefore eliminated these items, while retaining all others that met the criterion.

Discriminant Validity of the Scale Items (Critical Ratio):

Turning to item-discrimination validity, the item discrimination index gauges an item's capacity to differentiate between contrasting groups—in this case, the upper and lower segments of the distribution. A higher index indicates greater discriminatory power, effectively separating those who master and understand the construct from those who do not.

To assess this property for both the Social Intelligence Scale and the Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale, the study treated each instrument's total score as an external criterion. Scores were ranked in descending order, and the top 27 % (twelve administrators) and bottom 27 % (twelve administrators) were selected to represent the high- and low-ability groups, respectively. Mean scores for each item were then calculated within both groups. The critical-ratio (CR) statistic was employed to compare these means: a CR of 1.96 corresponds to a 0.95 confidence level ($\alpha = 0.05$), whereas a CR of -2.58 corresponds to a 0.99 confidence level ($\alpha = 0.01$). When a given item's CR met or exceeded these thresholds, the difference between group means was deemed statistically significant, confirming that the item reliably distinguishes between higher- and lower-performing respondents rather than reflecting chance variation.

Table (3): Discrimination Indices of the Social Intelligence and Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale Items

Organizational Citizenship Behavior Scale															
Item	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Disc	4.32*	2.5** 7	1.9** 7	2.98*	3.46*	2.74*	3.85*	2.3** 8	3.61*	4.06*	1.9** 7	3.47*	2.77*	3.83*	3.26*
Item	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23							

Disc	2.4** 2	3.23*	4.38*	2.82*	2.53*	2.3** 6	2.79*	3.00*							
Social Intelligence Scale															
Item	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	15
Disc	2.2** 6	4.60*	2.7** 3	3.44*	3.58*	3.65*	3.21*	4.24*	2.3** 5	1.98*	2.4** 9	3.75*	2.3** 8	4.00*	3.87*
Item	16	17	18	19	20	21	22	23	24	25	26	27	28	29	30
Disc	2.9** 76	2.79*	2.6** 9	3.77*	3.63*	4.14*	3.53*	4.00*	2.97*	2.57*	3.65*	2.64*	2.78*	3.87*	2.3** 9
Item	31	32	33	34	35	36	37								
Disc	2.4** 8	1.9** 9	2.3** 3	3.57*	2.3** 6	2.3** 2	2.2** 8								

* Significant at the 0.01 level

** Significant at the 0.05 level

Analysis of Table 3 indicates statistically significant differences at both the 0.01 and 0.05 levels between the mean scores of administrators with high versus low social-intelligence levels on each instrument—Social Intelligence and Organizational Citizenship Behavior. In every case, the advantage lies with the high-social-intelligence group, demonstrating that both scales discriminate effectively between higher and lower scorers on the respective constructs. This outcome confirms the construct validity of the measures.

B - Scale Reliability: Test-Retest Method

Turning to reliability, the study employed the test–retest method. The two instruments were administered to the same sample of forty-seven administrative faculty members on two occasions separated by a two-week interval. Table 6 reports the resulting correlation coefficients, which attest to satisfactory

stability over time. The correlation coefficients for the scales are presented in Table (4).

Table (4): Reliability Coefficients of Social Intelligence and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors by Test-Retest Method (n = 47)

Variable	Reliability Coefficient	Significance
Social Intelligence	0.656	0.01
Organizational Citizenship Behaviors	0.605	0.01

The Cronbach’s alpha was computed first for every sub-dimension, then for each scale in aggregate. Results are shown in Table 5.

Table (5): Cronbach’s Alpha Coefficients for the Dimensions of the Variables

Dimensions	Cronbach’s Alpha	Dimensions	Cronbach’s Alpha
Social Awareness	0.543	Courtesy	0.548
Social Self-Efficacy	0.532	Altruism	0.587
Social Empathy	0.543	Conscientiousness Awareness	0.635
Social Problem Solving	0.567	////////////////////	
Social Intelligence	0.546	Organizational Citizenship	0.590

From Table 5, the following points are noted. For Organizational Citizenship Behavior, Cronbach’s alpha for each item within the first dimension (courtesy), the second (altruism), and the third (conscientiousness) was lower than

the overall alpha, with the exception of item 11 in the second dimension and item 6 in the third; these items were therefore deleted. Although retaining them would have reduced the overall alpha for their respective dimensions by 0.096 (second dimension) and 0.199 (third dimension), the researcher preferred to remove them in order to obtain the highest reliability attainable.

With respect to Social Intelligence, Cronbach's alpha for each item within the first dimension (social awareness), the second (social self-efficacy), the third (social empathy), and the fourth (social problem-solving) was lower than the overall alpha, except for item 3 in the third dimension; these items were deleted as well. Although retaining them would have lowered the overall alpha for the third dimension by 0.155, the researcher opted to remove them to maximise reliability.

Cronbach's alpha coefficients for the two variables—Social Intelligence and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors—were high even without deleting any item, which indicates a high degree of reliability. Moreover, the items removed from both variables were those with the weakest item–dimension associations, as shown in the internal-consistency validity results reported in the preceding table. This convergence supports the accuracy of the findings.

Accordingly, the final version of the Social Intelligence Scale comprises 36 items, whereas the Bullying Behavior Scale comprises 21 items. On this basis, the instruments used in the present study (Social Intelligence and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors) exhibit high reliability and validity, making them suitable for use in this research.

Field Data Coding and Analysis

General Characteristics of the Sample

Table (6): Socio-Organizational Variables of Respondents

Variable	Categories	Frequency	Percentage
Age	Less than 30 years	8	17.02%
	31 – 41 years	25	53.19%
	42 – 52 years	10	21.27%
	Over 53 years	4	8.51%
Family Status	Single	24	51.06%
	Married	13	27.65%
	Divorced	8	17.02%
	Widowed	2	4.25%
Administrative Status	Vice Dean	5	10.63%
	Head of Department	8	17.02%
	Assistant department head	12	25.53%
	Program Coordinator	22	46.80%
Years in Administration	5 years or less	21	44.68%
	From 6 to 11 years	19	40.42%
	More than 12 years	7	14.89%

Results and Interpretations of the Research Hypotheses:

Result and Interpretation of the First Hypothesis:

Statement: The level of social intelligence among female academic administrators is high.

Test: one-sample t-test against the hypothetical mean.

Table (7): Mean social-intelligence score among female academic administrators

Sample Size	Arithmetic Mean	Hypothetical Mean	Standard Deviation	Degrees of Freedom	T-Value	Significance Level
47	92.32	75	7.85	46	15.12	0.001

Note: The hypothetical mean was obtained by summing the weights of response options, dividing by the number of options, then multiplying by the number of items.

From Table (07), the mean score on the Social Intelligence Scale is 92.32 (SD = 7.85), exceeding the hypothetical mean of 75. The calculated t (15.12) is larger than the tabulated value and is statistically significant at 0.001. This indicates that the social-intelligence level of the sample is above the hypothetical level; the sample is characterized by a high level of social intelligence.

Hypothesis 2 and interpretation

Statement: There are statistically significant differences in social-intelligence level attributable to years of service in administration.

Test: Mann Whitney test for two independent samples using SPSS.

Table (08): Mann Whitney test for differences in social-intelligence ranks by years in administration

Administrative Work Experience	Five Years or Less (n = 21)	More Than Six Years (n = 26)	Z-Value	Significance Level
--------------------------------	-----------------------------	------------------------------	---------	--------------------

Dimensions	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks		
Social Awareness	26.68	373.50	22.86	754.50	0.88-	Not Sig
Social Self-Efficacy	22.11	309.50	24.80	818.50	0.62-	Not Sig
Social Empathy	24.96	349.50	23.59	778.50	0.32-	Not Sig
Social Problem-Solving	24.75	346.50	23.68	781.50	0.24-	Not Sig
Total Social Intelligence	24.59	359.50	23.71	767.50	0.55-	Not Sig

As shown in Table (08), there are no statistically significant differences in social-intelligence level—across all dimensions—by years of administrative service (five years or less vs more than six years). Z values range from -0.24 to -0.88 and are non-significant.

Hypothesis 3 and interpretation

Statement: The level of organizational citizenship behaviors among female academic administrators is high.

Test: one-sample t-test against the hypothetical mean.

Table (9): Organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) level among female academic administrators

Sample Size	Arithmetic Mean	Hypothetical Mean	Standard Deviation	Degrees of Freedom	T-Value	Significance Level
47	96.14	75	6.25	46	17.25	0.001

From Table (09), the mean OCB score is 96.14 (SD = 6.25), exceeding the hypothetical mean of 75. The calculated t (17.25) is greater than the tabulated value and is statistically significant at 0.001. This indicates that the sample displays a high level of organizational citizenship behaviors.

Hypothesis 4 and interpretation

Statement: There are statistically significant differences in OCB attributable to years of service in administration.

Test: Mann Whitney test for two independent samples using SPSS.

Table (10): Mann Whitney test for differences in OCB ranks by years in administration

Administrative Work Experience Dimensions	Five Years or Less (n = 21)		More Than Six Years (n = 26)		Z-Value	Significance Level
	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks	Mean Rank	Sum of Ranks		
Courtesy	24.68	343.50	23.86	787.50	0.18-	Not Sig
Conscientiousness	25.93	363.50	23.18	865.50	0.63-	Not Sig
Altruism	25.39	363.50	23.17	764.50	0.62-	Not Sig
Sportsmanship	22.75	310.50	23.68	781.50	0.24-	Not Sig

Total Citizenship Behaviors	24.5 9	355.5 0	23.4 1	772.5 0	1.25-	Not Sig
-----------------------------	-----------	------------	-----------	------------	-------	---------

As indicated in Table (10), there are no statistically significant differences in OCB—across all dimensions—by years of administrative service (five years or less vs more than six years). Z values range from -0.18 to -1.25 and are non-significant.

Result of the General Hypothesis

The study's general hypothesis stated that there is a positive association between social intelligence and organizational citizenship behaviors among female academic administrators. To test this hypothesis, correlation coefficients were computed. The results are reported below.

Table (11): Correlations between dimensions of the Social Intelligence Scale and the Organizational Citizenship Behavior (OCB) Scale among female faculty administrators

Dimensions of Social Intelligence	Courtesy	Conscientiousness	Altruism	Sportsmanship	Overall Organizational Citizenship Behaviors
Social Awareness	0.181	0.418*	0.476*	0.450*	0.307**
η^2	0.06	0.20	0.21	0.21	0.003
Effect Size	Small	Large	Large	Large	Small
Social Self-Efficacy	0.306**	0.319**	0.064	0.065	0.515*
η^2	0.22	0.07	0.006	0.006	0.23
Effect Size	Large	Medium	Small	Small	Large
Social Empathy	0.349**	0.015	0.316**	0.014	0.503*
η^2	0.06	0.00	0.11	0.00	0.21
Effect Size	Medium	None	Medium	None	Large
Social Problem Solving	0.178	0.398*	0.315**	0.050	0.129

η^2	0.000	0.20	0.08	0.007	0.001
Effect Size	None	Large	Medium	Small	Small
Overall Social Intelligence	0.348**	0.376*	0.259	0.350	0.443*
η^2	0.06	0.21	0.005	0.09	0.23
Effect Size	Medium	Large	Small	Medium	Large

* Significant at the 0.01 level

** Significant at the 0.05 level

Interpretation:

As shown in Table (11), there is a statistically significant positive correlation at the 0.01 level between social awareness and the OCB dimensions (courtesy, conscientiousness, altruism, and sportsmanship), with correlation coefficients reported as 0.06, 0.20, 0.21, and 0.21, respectively. At the 0.05 level, social awareness is also significantly related to overall OCB, with $r = 0.307$. Likewise, the correlation between social self-efficacy and overall OCB is significant ($r = 0.515$, $p \leq 0.01$), and at the 0.05 level social self-efficacy correlates with courtesy and conscientiousness ($r = 0.306$ and 0.319 , respectively). For social empathy, the association with overall OCB is significant ($r = 0.503$, $p \leq 0.01$), and at the 0.05 level it correlates with courtesy and altruism ($r = 0.349$ and 0.316). Social problem-solving shows a significant link with conscientiousness ($r = 0.398$, $p \leq 0.01$) and, at the 0.05 level, with altruism ($r = 0.315$). Finally, both total social intelligence and total OCB are positively related, with reported coefficients of 0.443 and 0.376 ($p \leq 0.01$), and, at the 0.05 level, social intelligence correlates with courtesy ($r = 0.348$).

Field Study Results

The field results of the present study indicate that the level of social intelligence among female academic administrators at Mohamed Khider University of Biskra is high. Social intelligence was examined through dimensions specified in the study's operational definition—social awareness, social empathy, social self-efficacy, and social problem-solving—given their salience in the university organizational setting. Social awareness helps develop work relationships within the university, whether between the administrative faculty member and students, with fellow academics, or with administrative staff; it also supports conflict management inside the university, strengthens empathy and mutual respect, and enables professional handling of the situations the administrative academic encounters at Biskra. Social self-efficacy denotes the administrator's reliance on her capacity to navigate diverse situations in the university work environment in order to achieve the desired objectives across contexts. Social empathy helps the administrative academic cultivate empathetic relations with others, regardless of their position. It is a cornerstone of a healthy, productive work environment in the university and matters in several ways: it strengthens relationships and trust; when employees feel understood and supported, they become more open and engaged; it facilitates effective cooperation and team cohesion, thereby advancing shared goals; it improves conflict resolution by enabling more effective communication in moments of disagreement; and it raises loyalty and motivation when staff feel valued by colleagues and supervisors.

The field results also show that Organizational Citizenship Behaviors (OCB) are high in the study sample. OCB was measured using dimensions established in this

study: courtesy, altruism, conscientiousness, and sportsmanship. OCB is conceived as a contract between the individual and the organization grounded in social exchange and interpersonal trust; adherence to this implicit contract fosters and develops OCB and, in turn, enhances organizational effectiveness in the university. These behaviors are voluntary rather than compulsory; they arise from personal choice to assume extra-role tasks within the organization. Such voluntary behaviors go beyond any mere “call of duty”; they represent a durable, self-imposed commitment to achieving success and are necessary for the continuity of administrative work in academia. Although OCB may not yield short-term financial returns for the individual, it produces positive outcomes at both the individual and organizational levels. Consequently, such extra-role conduct is taken into account in performance evaluations of female academic administrators at Mohamed Khider University of Biskra and in long-term comparisons among peers.

Finally, the results indicate a positive, direct relationship between social-intelligence level and the practice of OCB within the university. Accordingly, an administrative academic at the University of Biskra who possesses a high level of social intelligence is more inclined and more willing to engage in OCB. These behaviors benefit not only the individual administrator but also the university as a whole by contributing to a more positive work environment.

Conclusion:

This study explored the relationship between social intelligence and Organizational Citizenship Behaviors among female administrative faculty at the University of Biskra, and

underscores the salience of the findings for the academic environment. The analysis identified statistically significant associations between multiple dimensions of social intelligence and the practice of Organizational Citizenship Behaviors. These links are not merely theoretical; they bear directly on the university's overall performance and on the quality of its academic climate.

Administrators with higher levels of social awareness, social empathy, and social problem-solving were more inclined to engage in voluntary behaviors that exceed formal job descriptions. Altruism, conscientiousness, sportsmanship, and courtesy do not only facilitate day-to-day operations. They strengthen organisational cohesion and cultivate a sense of belonging and shared responsibility toward the university and its objectives.

The results point to a clear institutional implication for Algerian universities: prioritising the development of social intelligence among faculty, administrators, and staff. Teaching and research alone do not secure institutional excellence. A healthy organisational environment that encourages cooperation and constructive interaction is a foundational condition for high performance. Targeted capacity-building can help achieve this aim, including focused training and workshops that enhance social skills such as active listening, conflict resolution, team building, and an informed understanding of interpersonal dynamics.

References:

Ibrahim Mohamed Al-Mughazi. (2003). *Social and Emotional Intelligence in the Twenty-First Century*. Mansoura: Al-Iman Library.

Ikhlas Al-Khalidi. (2009). *Social Intelligence and Its Relationship with Internal-External Locus of Control among Baghdad University Students*. Master's Thesis. University of Baghdad.

Hamed Abdel-Salam Zahran. (2000). *Social Psychology* (Vol. 6). Cairo: Alam Al-Kutub.

Khetam Abdulrahman Al-Suhaymat. (n.d.). *Organizational Citizenship Behavior among Secondary School Teachers in Jordan and Its Relationship to Their Job Performance*. Doctoral Dissertation. Jordan: Amman University.

Kheira Berraf. (2007). *Empowerment and Its Impact on Organizational Citizenship*. Master's Thesis. Algeria: Institute of Commercial Sciences and Management.

Dhawqat Obeidat, et al. (2001). *Scientific Research: Its Concept, Tools, and Methods*. Jordan: Dar Al-Fikr.

Abdul-Salam Bin Shayea Al-Qahtani. (2016). *Organizational Citizenship Behavior and Its Relationship to Administrative Creativity*. Riyadh: University Book House.

Karl Albrecht. (2006). *Social Intelligence: The New Science of Success*. Cairo: Arab Media Company.

Mohamed Said Abu Halawa. (2005). *The Position of Social Intelligence within the Human Personality System*. Alexandria: Faculty of Education.

Mutashar Abdul Sahib Muntaha. (2011). *Personality Types According to Innovation Theory, Values, and Social Intelligence*. Amman, Jordan: Safaa Publishing House.

Walid Chelabi, & Salah Eddine Cheikhaoui. (June, 2020). *The Reality of Organizational Citizenship Behaviors among Local Authority Employees in M'sila Province*. Al-Ibrahimi Journal of Psychological and Educational Studies

To cite this article:

Author. (Year). "Title of the article". Almawaqif . Vol.. N°. Month, Year, pp..