

The Level of Social Intelligence among University Students in Biskra.

Chetioui Abdelmalek^{1*}, Saada Salim²

¹ Univ-Biskra (Algeria), e-mail a.chetioui@univ-biskra.dz

² Univ-Biskra (Algeria), e-mail salim.saada@univ-biskra.dz

Laboratory of Studies and Research in the Sciences and Technologies
of Physical and Sports Activities

Received: 27-07-2023

Accepted: 15-04-2024

Published: 30-07-2024

Abstract: the aim of the current study was to determine the level of social intelligence among students of the Institute of Sciences and Technologies of Physical and Sports Activities, and to identify whether there are differences in social intelligence levels between students of the Institute of Sciences and Technologies of Physical and Sports Activities based on their academic level. Additionally, the study aimed to determine whether there are differences in social intelligence levels between students of the Institute of Sciences and Technologies of Physical and Sports Activities and students of other majors. For this purpose, the researchers used a descriptive methodology on a sample of 420 male and female students who were selected using random sampling. The researchers used the Social Intelligence Scale by Mr. Abu Hashem (2008), and the data was statistically analyzed using SPSS version 25. The results showed that the level of social intelligence among students of the Institute of Sciences and Technologies of Physical and Sports Activities is high. Additionally, statistically significant differences were found in the level of social intelligence among students of the students of the Institute of Sciences and Technologies of Physical and Sports Activities based on their academic level, while there were no statistically significant differences in the level of social intelligence between students of the students of the Institute of Sciences and Technologies of Physical and Sports Activities and students of other majors.

Keywords: Social Intelligence; University Students; Students of the Institute

* Corresponding author.

I. Introduction:

Human beings are among the most noble creations distinguished from other creatures by various characteristics that help them adapt to life. The most important of these is the gift of intellect, which enables humans to perceive events and situations around them. Therefore, human intelligence is a crucial and influential factor in individual life.

Intelligence is a topic that has attracted the interest of many psychologists. The research on the concept of intelligence began with Thurn-dike, who theorized that intelligence is a general structure consisting of three interconnected and interrelated types: abstract intelligence, which involves managing and understanding ideas; mechanical intelligence, which involves managing and understanding physical objects; and social intelligence, which involves managing and understanding others. Thurn-dike clarified that social intelligence varies according to gender and social status. Some people interact with adults differently than they do with children, and some have the ability to take on leadership roles in groups, while others prefer submission and obedience (Mansour et al., 2004, p. 280).

Here, it is worth mentioning social intelligence, considering that humans are social animals just like bees and ants. They cannot live in isolation from others within their community. There are social relationships and interactions that occur among individuals within a community. The individual's ability to understand what lies within others and their capacity to comprehend those around them fall under their social intelligence. Social intelligence is the ability to understand and control others and manage them in a way that allows individuals to build human relationships wisely and effectively (Ahmed Hazem Al-Taie, 2009, p. 110).

As for Gardner, he indicated that intelligence in the reciprocal relationships between people is the ability to understand others, what motivates them, and how to cooperate with them. Regarding social personality intelligence and its distinctiveness, he identified four specifications: leadership, the ability to develop and maintain relationships and friendships, conflict resolution skills, and social analysis skills (Tarek Abdel-Raouf, 2008, p. 23).

Zirkle (2000) believes that social intelligence is closely related to an individual's personality and behavior. Individuals with social intelligence possess complete self-awareness and have the ability to understand their environment through understanding others. They respond appropriately to individuals with different motivations, as well as have the capability to form social relationships, develop friendships, and identify the desires of others (Hamed Abdullah, 2014, p. 146).

The success of a person in life depends on skills that are unrelated to their degree or academic achievement. It relies on their acquisition of social skills that make them an active member of society. Here, we specifically mention university students, considering that this group is one of the most important segments of young people. Most studies focus on university students due to their impact on life and influence on society. As they are approaching the transition to professional life, individuals need to acquire social intelligence skills and the ability to build successful relationships with others.

1. Study Problem:

The importance of social intelligence for university students lies in its significance in building a well-balanced individual capable of giving, working, facing challenges, and establishing healthy positive relationships. It enables them to understand the university community around them and interact with others in a proper manner. Social intelligence plays a vital role in an individual's life, as it forms the basis for their future and aspirations. The importance does not solely lie in the presence of social intelligence but also in how it is utilized and its application in practical life. This is supported by studies conducted by Manabri (2010) and Cavenz (2005), which indicated a relationship between social intelligence and students' academic performance.

However, there are certain challenges that hinder students' ambitions. Some face difficulty adapting to university life, while others may have an aversion to cultural, social, and artistic activities held at the university. Additionally, some students may struggle with social issues, such as a tendency towards isolation and difficulty in forming friendships. On the other hand, some students excel in openness, social flexibility, communication, and participation in various activities.

This variation among students can be attributed to individual differences in their level of social intelligence. Thus, it provides a strong rationale for conducting this study to verify certain assumptions, test their validity, understand the different aspects involved, and answer the following questions:

- 1- What is the level of social intelligence among students at the Institute of Science and techniques of Physical and Sport activities?
- 2- Are there statistically significant differences in social intelligence levels among students at the Institute of Science and techniques of Physical and Sport activities based on their academic level?
- 3- Are there statistically significant differences in social intelligence levels between students at the Institute of Science and techniques of Physical and Sport activities and students from other colleges?

2. Study Hypotheses:

The study hypotheses are as follows:

- 1- The level of social intelligence among students at the Institute of Sciences and Technologies of Physical and Sports Activities is high.
- 2- There are no significant differences in the level of social intelligence among students at the Institute of Science and techniques of Physical and Sport activities based on their academic level.
- 3- There are no significant differences in the level of social intelligence between students at the Institute of Science and techniques of Physical and Sport activities and students from other majors.

3. Study Objectives:

The current study aimed to achieve the following objectives:

- 1- To determine the level of social intelligence among students at the Institute of Science and techniques of Physical and Sport activities.
- 2- To investigate the differences in the level of social intelligence among students at the Institute of Science and techniques of Physical and Sport activities based on their academic level.

- 3- To examine the differences in the level of social intelligence between students at the Institute of Science and techniques of Physical and Sport activities and students from other faculties

4. Study Importance:

The significance of this study lies in its focus on university students as they represent the future leaders and professionals who need to be well-equipped with various aspects that could significantly shape their present and future behavior. Understanding and studying the levels of social intelligence among university students can aid in harnessing the positive aspects to serve their psychological and social compatibility.

Moreover, the importance of this study also lies in its scientific contribution to the fields of psychological and educational research. By exploring the level of social intelligence among university students and investigating its correlation with certain variables, it adds to the body of knowledge in these fields.

5. Procedural Definition of Study Variables:

5.1. Social Intelligence:

In the field of social sciences, social intelligence is defined as "an individual's ability to deal with new situations that involve mutual relationships with members of a community." (Ahmed Zakī Badawī, 1982, p. 389).

In the educational glossary, it is defined as "the skill of an individual to adapt and build healthy social relationships with others." (Mohammed Al-Khawli, 1980, p. 450).

According to Gardner, it is described as "the ability to perceive the emotional states of others, distinguish them, understand their intentions, motivations, and feelings, and the capacity for successful social interactions and expressing empathy towards others." (Gardner, 1995, p. 72).

From the perspective of Karl Albrecht, social intelligence is defined as "the ability to communicate with others, in addition to a set of practical skills that aid in appropriate behavior in any situation." (Karl Albrecht, 2007, p. 3).

Operationally, it refers to the score obtained by University students Biskra on the social intelligence scale used in the current study.

5.2. University Students:

They are the male and female students who are pursuing their studies at Mohamed khider University biskra during the academic year (2022/2023).

6. Presenting Some Previous Studies :

6.1. Daheri and Sufyan Study (1997): This study aimed to determine the level of social intelligence and social values among psychology students at Taiz University and their relationship

with psychological and social success. The study was conducted on a random sample of 327 second, third, and fourth-year students. The researcher used the social intelligence scale, the psychological and social compatibility scale, and the social values scale. The study found that psychology students at Taiz University have high levels of social intelligence, social values, and psychological and social compatibility. Moreover, there is a statistically significant relationship between social intelligence and psychological and social compatibility. However, no statistically significant relationship was found between social values and psychological and social compatibility. Additionally, there were no significant differences in social intelligence based on gender, while differences were observed based on academic level, favoring the fourth-year students.

6.2. Ability Study (2007): This study aimed to determine the level of social intelligence and its relationship with religiosity among students at the Islamic University. It also aimed to identify the relationship between social intelligence and the variables of college, specialization, and academic level. The study included a sample of 650 male and female students from various faculties at the Islamic University in Gaza. The researcher used the social intelligence scale and the religiosity scale. The study revealed a high level of social intelligence and religiosity among students at the Islamic University in Gaza. Moreover, it confirmed a positive relationship between religiosity and social intelligence scores. No significant differences were found between male and female students or among different specializations. However, differences were observed based on academic level, favoring the fourth-year students.

6.3. Mazi Zaynat Study (2017): This study aimed to identify the level of social intelligence among university students and whether it differs based on gender and specialization. The study was conducted on a sample of 80 first-year Master's students in psychology at the University of lagouat, chosen randomly. The researcher used the social intelligence questionnaire developed by Mr. Mohammed Abu Hashem (2008) to collect data. The study found a high level of social intelligence among first-year Master's students in psychology at the University of lagouat. Additionally, no significant differences were found in social intelligence based on gender and specialization.

6.4. Hiba Muayyid Mohammad Study (2017): This study aimed to identify the level of social intelligence among engineering college students at the University of Baghdad. It also investigated whether the level of social intelligence differs based on gender and academic stage. The study was conducted on a sample of 100 male and female students from the Environmental Engineering Department, chosen purposively. The researcher used Sufyan's social intelligence scale (1998) to collect data. The study found that social intelligence exists among engineering college students at the University of Baghdad. No statistically significant differences were found in social intelligence based on gender, but differences were observed based on the academic stage, favoring the fourth stage.

6.5. Kurat and Hakam Study (2018): This study aimed to investigate the relationship between social intelligence and psychological well-being among students of the Humanities and Social Sciences Department at the University of Saida. It also aimed to identify the level of social intelligence among these students and whether it differs based on gender and specialization. The study was conducted on a sample of 71 male and female students from different academic years, chosen randomly. The researcher used psychological well-being and social intelligence scales. The study found a positive relationship between psychological well-being and social intelligence among

students of the Humanities and Social Sciences Department. Additionally, differences were found in the level of social intelligence based on gender and specialization, but no significant differences were observed in social intelligence based on academic year.

6.6. Jain & Saxena Study (2013): This study aimed to explore the levels of social intelligence among university students concerning their gender and academic specialization. The study included a sample of 351 male and female undergraduate students (210 males and 141 females) from various scientific and humanistic majors at Bahlis Government University. The study used the Social Intelligence Scale developed by Kahdah Ganish for the Indian environment. The results indicated that the level of social intelligence was generally high and higher among females compared to males. Moreover, students in the humanities had higher levels of social intelligence, particularly in dimensions like humor, cooperation, and honesty. No significant differences were found in other dimensions based on gender or specialization.

6.7. Vardihini Study (2013): This study aimed to explore the level of social intelligence in various dimensions among students at Russell Sema Indian University. The study included a sample of 90 male and female students (49 males and 41 females) from different scientific majors in their first four academic years. The researcher used the Social Intelligence Scale developed by Kahdah Ganish for the Indian environment. The results showed that the level of social intelligence was moderate among Indian students and higher among males compared to females. The study also revealed that patience ranked first, while a sense of fun ranked last among the dimensions of social intelligence. No statistically significant differences were found in the level of social intelligence among students based on gender, but there were significant differences based on academic stage, favoring the fourth-year students.

I. Methods and Materials:

1. Survey Study:

The survey study was conducted on a sample of (50) male and female students who are pursuing their studies at Biskra University. The sample consisted of (27) male students, accounting for (54%), and (23) female students, accounting for (46%). The purpose of this study was to assess the appropriateness of the study tool for the selected sample and to ensure the psychometric properties of the scale. The results of the survey study confirmed that the scale had high psychometric properties and was suitable for the study sample.

2. Study Design:

Considering the nature of the current study and the procedures required for data collection and analysis, a descriptive research design was used. This design is well-suited for the study's objectives and necessitates accurate methodological steps to attain scientific and objective results.

3. Study Population:

The study population comprised 31,124 male and female students from mohamed khider University in biskra, registered during the academic year 2022-2023. They were distributed among one institute and six colleges, which are the Institute of Physical Education and Sports Science, the Faculty of Exact Sciences and Natural Sciences, the Faculty of Economics, Commercial and

Management Sciences, the Faculty of Science and Technology, the Faculty of Law and Political Science, the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences, and the Faculty of Arts and Languages.

4. Study Sample:

The study sample consisted of (420) male and female undergraduate students selected using a stratified sampling method. This sample constituted (10%) of the study population, The following table illustrates the distribution of the sample members.

Table No: (01) shows the distribution of the sample members based on their academic specialization and level.

percentage	Research sample			nature	variable
	number	female	male		
27.9%	117	08	109	Institute of Physical Education and Sports Sciences	Academic major
12.4%	52	27	25	Faculty of Exact and Natural Sciences	
12.1%	51	23	28	Faculty of Economics, Commerce, and Management Sciences	
9.5%	40	17	23	Faculty of Science and Technology	
11.4%	48	26	22	Faculty of Law and Political Science	
14.0%	59	31	28	Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences	
12.6%	53	30	23	Faculty of Arts and Languages	
100%	420	162	258	Total	
34.7%	146	62	84	First Year of Bachelor's Degree	Academic level
36.6%	154	53	101	Second Year of Bachelor's Degree	
28.5%	120	47	73	Third Year of Bachelor's Degree	
100%	420	162	258	Total	

5. Instrument Study:

The social intelligence scale was developed by Mr. Abu Hashem in 2008, The scale consists of 90 items based on previous foreign and Arab studies. The initial form of the scale was presented to a group of 10 reviewers, faculty members from the Faculty of Education at Zagazig University in Egypt and King Saud University in Saudi Arabia, Nine items were subsequently deleted from the scale due to similarities in their content with other items, The agreement percentage among the

reviewers regarding the scale ranged from 90% to 100%, resulting in the final version of the scale with 81 items, of which 76 items were positive statements and six were negative statements. The scale responses were rated on a five-point Likert scale, ranging from (5-1) for positive statements and (1-5) for negative statements. The response options included: strongly disagree, disagree, uncertain, agree, and strongly agree.

Regarding the scoring method, the total score for each participant was determined by assigning a response score to each item on the scale. These scores were then summed to calculate the overall score for each questionnaire. The total score for the scale ranged from a minimum of 81 to a maximum of 405.

Table No: (02) illustrates the distribution of items across the dimensions of the social intelligence

Total	Item Numbers	Dimensions of Social Intelligence	Number
13	73-67-61-55-49-43-37-31-25-19-13-7-1	Social Information Processing	01
13	74-64-62-56-50-44-38-32-26-20-14-8-2	Social Skills	02
13	75-69-63-57-51-45-39-33-27-21-15-9-3	Social Awareness	03
16	40-34-28-22-16-10-446--481-79-77-76-70-64-58-	Social Self-Efficacy	04
12	65-59-53-47-41-35-29-23-17-11-5	Social Empathy	05
14	80-78-72-66-60-54-48-42-36-30-24-18-12-6	Social Problem Solving	06

6. Psychometric Properties of the Social Intelligence Scale in the Current Study:

The scale was applied to the initial survey sample, which consisted of 50 male and female participants from the original study population of 420 male and female students. The purpose was to ensure the psychometric properties of the scale. The following is a description of the psychometric properties of the scale:

6.1.Validity:

6.1.1. Internal Consistency:

The validity of the scale was determined by calculating or estimating the correlations between the dimensions and the total score of the social intelligence scale using Pearson correlation coefficient. The correlations between the scale dimensions and the total score were all statistically significant at a level of significance ($p < 0.001$). The values of the correlation coefficient ranged between the highest correlation, which was between the dimension of social self-efficacy ($r = 0.942$), and the total score of the scale, and the lowest correlation ($r = 0.791$) between the dimension of social skills and the total score of the scale. Overall, it can be concluded that the social intelligence scale is valid, as shown in the following table:

Table No: (03) illustrates the correlation between the dimensions of the social intelligence scale and the total score of the scale.

statistical significance	correlation coefficient with total score	dimensions	
,000	,923**	Social Information Processing	01
,000	,791**	Social Skills	02
,000	,819**	Social Awareness	03
,000	,942**	Social Self-Efficacy	04
,000	,883**	Social Empathy	05
,000	,917**	Social Problem Solving	06
** Significant at the 0.01 level			

From the results in Table No. (03), it is evident that all correlation coefficients for the dimensions of the social intelligence scale are statistically significant at the level of ($p < 0.01$). This confirms the homogeneity and internal consistency of the scale as an indicator of the construct validity in measuring social intelligence.

6.2. Scale Reliability:

Since the scale was applied in a similar Arabic environment to the Algerian context and its reliability coefficient was estimated to be (0.94), Cronbach's alpha coefficient was calculated for this scale and its sub-dimensions. The following result was obtained:

Table No: (04): Illustrates the reliability coefficient for the social intelligence scale and its sub-dimensions.

Number of items	Cronbach's Alpha	dimensions	
13	0,756	Social Information Processing	01
13	0,658	Social Skills	02
13	0,723	Social Awareness	03

16	0,751	Social Self-Efficacy	04
12	0,506	Social Empathy	05
14	0,727	Social Problem Solving	06
81	0,935	The total score of the scale	

From the results in Table No. (04), it is evident that the reliability coefficient for the total score of the scale is (0.935), which is a high value indicating the stability of the scale. This makes it suitable for application in the current study.

7. Statistical Analysis:

After applying the study tools and using the statistical software in the social sciences (SPSS, version 25), a set of statistical methods was employed to process the obtained data. These methods include:

- 1.Frequency, mean, standard deviation, and relative weight.
- 2.One-sample t-test.
- 3.Two independent samples t-test.
4. One-way ANOVA.

II. Results and discussion:

1. Presentation of results related to the first question:

Text of the first question: "What is the level of social intelligence among students of the Institute of Sciences and Technologies of Physical and Sports Activities?"

Table No. (05) illustrates the mean scores, standard deviations, and relative weights of individuals' scores on the social intelligence scale with its six dimensions.

Rank	Relative weight	Standard deviation	Arithmetic Mean	total	Number of paragraphs	variable
1	%65,24	6,196	42,410	65	13	Social Information Processing
5	%63,76	5,752	41,354	65	13	Social Skills
3	%64,61	5,909	42,008	65	13	Social Awareness
6	%62,18	9,903	49,752	80	16	Social Self-Efficacy
4	%63,95	4,035	38,376	60	12	Social Empathy

2	%64,95	6,501	45,478	70	14	Social Problem Solving
	%72,86	33,433	295,128	405	81	total

From Table No. (05), it is evident that the mean score of social intelligence among students of the Institute of Sciences and Technologies of Physical and Sports Activities is (295.128) with a general standard deviation of (33.433) and a relative weight of (72.86%), indicating that the level of social intelligence among these students is high.

As the social intelligence scale has six dimensions, it was observed that after processing the social information, it ranked first with a relative weight of (65.24%), followed by social problem-solving in the second position with a relative weight of (64.95%), and then social awareness in the third position with a relative weight of (64.61%). This was followed by social awareness and social skills with relative weights of (63.95%) and (63.76%) respectively, and finally social empathy in the last position with a relative weight of (62.18%).

To confirm the level of social intelligence among students of the Institute of Sciences and Technologies of Physical and Sports Activities, the actual mean score for the total score and its three dimensions was compared with the hypothetical mean for the scale and its six dimensions using the one-sample t-test. Table No. (06) illustrates the results obtained.

Conclusion	Statistical Significance	t-value	Difference between means	Hypothetical Mean	Standard deviation	Arithmetic Mean	variable
Statistically significant	,000	5,953	3,410	39	6,196	42,410	Social Information Processing
Statistically significant	,000	4,612	2,452	39	5,752	41,453	Social Skills
Statistically significant	,000	5,507	3,008	39	5,909	42,008	Social Awareness
Statistically significant	,058	1,914	1,752	48	10,499	49,068	Social Self-Efficacy
Statistically significant	,000	6,368	2,376	36	4,035	38,376	Social Empathy
Statistically significant	,000	5,787	3,478	42	6,501	45,478	Social Problem Solving
Statistically significant	,000	16,865	52,128	243	33,433	295,128	Total

From Table No. (06), it is evident that the differences between the mean scores of students from the Institute of Sciences and Technologies of Physical and Sports Activities on the social intelligence scale and its various dimensions, and the hypothetical mean, are statistically significant at a significance level of ($p < 0.001$ and $p < 0.005$). Since the mean score of students from the Institute of Sciences and Technologies of Physical and Sports Activities is higher than the hypothetical mean for the scale, this indicates that these students have a high level of social intelligence.

2. Presentation of results related to the second question:

Text of the second question: "Are there statistically significant differences in the level of social intelligence among students of the Institute of Sciences and Technologies of Physical and Sports Activities based on the variable of academic level?"

Table No. (07) illustrates the mean scores and standard deviations for the responses of students from Institute of Sciences and Technologies of Physical and Sports Activities on the social intelligence scale and its dimensions, according to the academic level.

Total (117)		Third Year of Bachelor's Degree (32)		Second Year of Bachelor's Degree (46)		First Year of Bachelor's Degree (39)		Dimensions
Standard deviation	Arithmetic Mean	Standard deviation	Arithmetic Mean	Standard deviation	Arithmetic Mean	Standard deviation	Arithmetic Mean	
6,19	42,41	6,78	44,87	4,79	42,43	6,56	40,35	Social Information Processing
5,75	41,45	6,46	43,56	4,23	41,63	6,16	39,51	Social Skills
5,90	42,00	6,07	43,31	4,93	42,86	6,38	39,92	Social Awareness
9,90	49,75	10,99	55,06	8,98	48,41	8,44	46,97	Social Self-Efficacy
4,03	38,37	4,19	39,53	2,82	39,04	4,60	36,64	Social Empathy
6,50	45,47	7,12	48,84	5,68	44,80	5,94	43,51	Social Problem Solving
33,43	295,12	37,91	312,84	37,61	292,78	37,02	283,35	Total

From Table No. (07), it is evident that there are differences in the mean scores of students from the Institute of Sciences and Technologies of Physical and Sports Activities on the social intelligence scale and its dimensions. Students in the third year of the undergraduate program ranked first with a mean score of (312.84), followed by students in the second year of the undergraduate program with a mean score of (292.78), and finally students in the first year of the undergraduate program with a mean score of (283.35). To determine whether these differences in mean scores are statistically significant at a significance level of ($p < 0.05$), a one-way ANOVA test was applied

Table No. (08) illustrates the results of the one-way ANOVA analysis for the responses of students from the Institute of Sciences and Technologies of Physical and Sports Activities on the social intelligence scale and its dimensions, according to the academic level.

Statistical Significance	F	Mean Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Source of Variation	Dimensions
0.008	4,99	179,26	2	358,52	between groups	Social Information Processing
		35,92	114	4095,77	within groups	
			116	4454,30	total	
0.011	4,66	145,32	2	290,65	between groups	Social Skills
		31,12	114	3548,33	within groups	
			116	3838,99	total	
0.023	3,87	129,06	2	258,13	between groups	Social Awareness
		33,27	114	3792,86	within groups	
			116	4050,99	total	
0.001	7,26	642,90	2	1285,81	between groups	Social Self-Efficacy
		88,52	114	10092,00	within groups	
			116	11377,81	total	
0.003	6,02	90,29	2	180,59	between groups	Social Empathy
		14,99	114	1708,85	within groups	
			116	1889,45	total	
0.001	6,96	266,99	2	533,99	between groups	Social Problem

The Level of Social Intelligence among University Students in Biskra

0.001	7,85	38,32	114	4369,20	within groups	Solving
			116	4903,19	total	
		7849,02	2	15698,05	between groups	Total
		999,69	114	113965,01	within groups	
			116	129663,07	total	

The results from Table (08) indicate the presence of statistically significant differences in the mean scores of students from the Institute of Sciences and Technologies of Physical and Sports Activities on the social intelligence scale and its six dimensions, based on the variable of academic level. Each (F) value was calculated to be between (3.87 - 7.85), and these values are statistically significant at a significance level of ($p < 0.001$). Therefore, there are differences in the level of social intelligence among students of the Institute of Sciences and Technologies of Physical and Sports Activities on the social intelligence scale and its six dimensions, based on their academic level, with the third year of the undergraduate program showing the highest level of social intelligence.

3. Presenting the results related to the third question:

Text of the third question: "Are there statistically significant differences in the level of social intelligence between students of the Institute of Sciences and Technologies of Physical and Sports Activities and students of other majors?"

Table No. (09) illustrates the mean scores and standard deviations for the responses of students from the University of Mohamed Khider in Biskra on the social intelligence scale and its dimensions, according to the academic major.

Total		Problem Solving		Social Empathy		Social Self-Efficacy		Social Awareness		Social Skills		Information Processing		Academic major
SD	AM	SD	AM	SD	AM	SD	AM	SD	AM	SD	AM	SD	AM	
33,43	295,12	6,50	45,47	4,03	38,37	9,90	49,75	5,90	42,00	5,75	41,45	6,19	42,41	Institute of Physical Education
30,17	289,11	6,70	45,15	4,27	37,80	9,67	49,96	5,70	41,80	5,36	40,82	5,90	41,94	Faculty of Exact and Natural Sciences
30,23	291,15	6,78	45,27	4,67	37,50	9,58	50,17	5,69	41,86	6,16	41,11	6,06	42,03	Faculty of Economics, Commerce

18,72	290,60	5,45	45,20	3,38	38,15	8,72	49,00	4,71	42,95	3,71	41,97	4,59	42,85	Faculty of Science and Technology
24,88	292,22	5,10	44,56	3,35	38,12	7,71	48,45	4,81	41,54	4,88	41,83	4,89	42,18	Faculty of Law and Political Science
24,53	294,77	5,62	46,16	3,49	38,38	9,09	49,72	5,28	43,08	4,50	42,11	5,03	43,23	Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences
30,83	288,20	5,19	44,07	3,79	37,50	8,11	47,98	5,62	41,37	5,38	40,49	5,28	41,26	Faculty of Arts and Languages
28,97	292,21	6,03	45,20	3,90	38,04	9,13	49,38	5,50	42,07	5,27	41,40	5,58	42,29	Total

From Table No. (09), it is evident that there are statistically significant differences in the mean scores of students from the University of Mohamed Khider in Biskra on the social intelligence scale and its different dimensions. Students from the Institute of Sciences and Technologies of Physical and Sports Activities ranked first with a mean score of (295.12), followed by students from the Faculty of Humanities and Social Sciences with a mean score of (294.77), and students from the Faculty of Law and Political Science ranked third with a mean score of (292.22). Students from the Faculty of Economics, Management, and Commercial Sciences ranked fourth with a mean score of (291.15), followed by students from the Faculty of Science and Technology and the Faculty of Natural Sciences ranked fifth and sixth with mean scores of (290.60) and (289.11) respectively. Finally, students from the Faculty of Arts and Foreign Languages ranked last with a mean score of (288.20).

To determine whether these mean score differences are statistically significant at a significance level of ($p < 0.05$), a one-way ANOVA test was applied.

Table No. (10) illustrates the results of the one-way ANOVA analysis for the responses of students from Mohamed Khider University on the social intelligence scale and its dimensions, based on the academic major.

Statistical Significance	F	Mean Squares	Degrees of Freedom	Sum of Squares	Source of Variation	Dimensions
0.644	0,707	22,157	6	132,942	between groups	Social Information Processing

The Level of Social Intelligence among University Students in Biskra

		31,352	413	12948,449	within groups	
			419	13081,390	total	
0.647	0,703	19,669	6	118,016	between groups	Social Skills
		27,973	413	11552,784	within groups	
			419	11670,800	total	
0.610	0,750	22,793	6	136,759	between groups	Social Awareness
		30,392	413	12551,953	within groups	
			419	12688,712	total	
0.850	0,443	37,263	6	223,578	between groups	Social Self-Efficacy
		84,077	413	34723,706	within groups	
			419	34947,283	total	
0.748	0,578	8,887	6	53,324	between groups	Social Empathy
		15,365	413	6345,904	within groups	
			419	6399,229	total	
0.658	0,689	25,243	6	151,459	between groups	Social Problem Solving
		36,626	413	15126,338	within	

					groups	
			419	15277,798	total	
0.754	571,0	482,204	6	2893,222	between groups	Total
		844,935	413	348958,061	within groups	
			419	351851,283	total	

The results of Table No. (10) indicate that there are no statistically significant differences at a significance level of ($p < 0.05$) in the scores of students from Mohamed Khider University on the social intelligence scale and its different dimensions, based on the academic major. The calculated values (F) ranged from (0.443 - 0.750), which suggests that there are no significant differences in the level of social intelligence between students from the Institute of Sciences and Technologies of Physical and Sports Activities and students from other majors in the social intelligence scale and its six dimensions

4. Discussion of the study results:

Regarding the first question, which asks: "What is the level of social intelligence among students of the Institute of Sciences and Technologies of Physical and Sports Activities?" The results indicate that the average level of social intelligence among students of the Institute of Sciences and Technologies of Physical and Sports Activities is high. The mean score of the study participants was (295.12) with a standard deviation of (33.43), indicating a high level of social intelligence. This can be attributed to the educational process, which goes beyond imparting knowledge and focuses on the overall growth of students. The university curriculum emphasizes building social relationships and developing social skills, which contributes to enhancing social intelligence among students. Moreover, student clubs and various activities provide real opportunities for students to develop their talents and abilities, leading to an increase in their social intelligence.

These results align with previous studies such as Dahri and Sufyan (1997), Al-Qudrah (2007), Mazy Zaynat (2017), Jain & Saxena (2013), which also found that the level of social intelligence among students was high.

As for the second question, which asks: "Are there statistically significant differences in the level of social intelligence among students of the Institute of Sciences and Technologies of Physical and Sports Activities based on their academic level?" The results showed that there are significant differences in the level of social intelligence among students based on their academic level, with the third-year students showing the highest mean score (312.34), followed by second-year students with a mean score of (292.78), and finally first-year students with a mean score of (283.35). This can be

attributed to the challenges that first-year students face in adapting to the university environment and interacting with others, unlike students in higher academic years who have developed positive attitudes towards social relationships within the university. These students have already overcome initial difficulties, and they possess social intelligence that helps them adapt and interact effectively with others. These results are consistent with previous studies such as Dahri and Sufyan (1997), Al-Qudrah (2007), Vardihini (2013), which found no significant differences in social intelligence based on academic level. However, this study's results differ from the study conducted by Hiba Muayyad Muhammad (2017), Vardihini (2013), which found significant differences in social intelligence based on academic level.

Regarding the third question, which asks: "Are there statistically significant differences in the level of social intelligence between students of the Institute of Sciences and Technologies of Physical and Sports Activities and students of other majors?" The results indicated no statistically significant differences in the level of social intelligence between students of the Institute of Sciences and Technologies of Physical and Sports Activities and students of other majors. This can be attributed to the common educational system, despite the differences in academic majors. The curriculum content in all majors emphasizes the social and psychological aspects of students. The university environment requires social interaction through educational and social relationships with professors, peers, administration, and student organizations. This environment contributes to the development of students' social intelligence through experiences and interactions. Regardless of their major, university students are required to develop social skills such as communication, cooperation, empathy, and competition. Therefore, social intelligence is not affected by students' academic majors.

These results align with previous studies such as Dahri and Sufyan (1997), Al-Qudrah (2007), Mazy Zaynat (2017), Vardihini (2013), which also found no significant differences in social intelligence based on academic majors. However, the results of this study differ from the study conducted by Jain & Saxena (2013), which found significant differences in social intelligence based on academic majors.

The results from Table (08) indicate the presence of statistically significant differences in the mean scores of students from the Institute of Sciences and Technologies of Physical and Sports Activities on the social intelligence scale and its six dimensions, based on the variable of academic level. Each (F) value was calculated to be between (3.87 - 7.85), and these values are statistically significant at a significance level of ($p < 0.001$). Therefore, there are differences in the level of social intelligence among students of Institute of Sciences and Technologies of Physical and Sports Activities on the social intelligence scale and its six dimensions, based on their academic level, with the third year of the undergraduate program showing the highest level of social intelligence.

IV- Conclusion:

Based on the study results and its objectives, which aimed to determine the level of social intelligence among students of the Institute of Sciences and Technologies of Physical and Sports Activities, as well as to investigate whether there are statistically significant differences in social intelligence among students based on their academic level and majors, the current study found that the level of social intelligence among the students of Mohamed Khider University in Biskra is high. Additionally, significant differences were observed in social intelligence among students based on

their academic level, with third-year students showing the highest level. However, no significant differences were found in social intelligence between students of the Institute of Sciences and Technologies of Physical and Sports Activities and students of other majors.

In conclusion, social intelligence is the ability of individuals to harmonize with others, understand their social environment, use their emotions, thoughts, and behaviors to solve social problems.

Recommendations and Suggestions of the Study:

1. Conduct further research on social intelligence and its relationship with new variables and different samples.
2. Conduct follow-up studies to identify the underlying factors behind variations in social intelligence levels among students.
3. Include curriculum activities and exercises in different educational stages to enhance the development of social intelligence skills in learners.
4. Investigate the effectiveness of counseling programs in fostering social intelligence among university students.

Referrals and references:

- 1- Albrecht, K. (2008), Social intelligence: The new science of success. Francisco: Jossey-Bass
- 2- Ahmad Hazim Ahmad Al-Ta'i (2009), building a measure of social decency for first-year students, faculty of Physical Education, University of Mosul, al-Rafidain Journal of Sports Sciences, Iraq, Vol .15, No. 52.
- 3- Al-manabri, Fatima (2010), social intelligence, social responsibility and academic achievement in a sample of female students of the Faculty of education at Umm Al-Qura University in Makkah. Unpublished PhD thesis, Faculty of Education, Umm Al-Qura University.
- 4- Al-Qudra, Musa Sobhi (2007), social intelligence among students of the Islamic University and its relationship to religion and some variables, unpublished master's thesis, Faculty of Education, Islamic University, Gaza.
- 5- Badawi, Ahmed Zaki (1982), glossary of terms of Social Sciences, Beirut, Lebanon library.
- 6- Cavins, B. (2005). The relationship between emotional – social intelligence and leadership practices among college student leads. A Dissertation Doctor of Education, Bowling Green State University in fulfillment.
- 7- Gardner , H (1995) : Intelligence :Multiple perspectives, New york, Basic Books
- 8- Gender and Subject Stream. SR Journal of Research & Method in Education, 1(4): 1-52

- 9- Hamed Abdullah talhafa (2014), the level of social intelligence among social studies teachers in Zarqa Governorate and its relationship to classroom interaction patterns, Educational Science Studies, Vol.41, No. 2.
- 10- Juchniewicz, J., The Influence of Social Intelligence on Effective Music Teaching. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Florida State University, USA. (2008).
- 11- Mansour Abdul Rahman and others (2004), educational planning, principles and fundamentals, Riyadh, Ministry of Education, Saudi Arabia.
- 12- Mr. Mohammed Abu Hashem (2008), components of social and emotional intelligence and the relational model between them among Egyptian and Saudi university students "Comparative Study", Volume XVIII, issue, 76, Journal of the Faculty of Education, Benha University, p.156-230
- 13- Kayal, Mukhtar Ahmed (2012), psychological structure of objective intelligence, social intelligence, personal intelligence and its relationship to the levels of information processing in the light of gender and academic specialization "confirmatory Factor Study", Journal of the Faculty of Education, Ain Shams University, Vol. 27, No. 1.
- 14- Saxena, S., & Jain, R. (2013). Social Intelligence of Undergraduate Students in relation to Their.
- 15- Tarek Abdul Rauf (2008), multiple intelligences, Al-yazouri scientific publishing and distribution house.
- 16-Vardhini, S. (2013). Social Intelligence of University Students. Conflux Journal of Educational Review, 1(3):2-5. Wim445.