

SOCIAL INTELLIGENCE AT WORK AND ITS IMPLICATION FOR ORGANIZATIONAL IDENTIFICATION: A SECTORAL COMPARISON

Alptekin Develí

Tokat Gaziosmanpaşa University, Erbaa Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities, Turkey

E-mail: alptekindeveli@gmail.com

Nazmiye Ülkü Pekkan

Tarsus University, Vocational School, Turkey

E-mail: nazmiyepakkan@tarsus.edu.tr

Mustafa Fedai Çavuş

Osmaniye Korkut Ata University, Faculty of Economics and Administrative Sciences, Turkey

E-mail: mfcavus@osmaniye.edu.tr

Submission: 1/19/2021

Accept: 3/9/2021

ABSTRACT

Since organizational identification is an important phenomenon for efficiency and productivity of the organization, its relationship with many variables has been examined. However, there is no study in the literature examining the relationship between organizational identification and social intelligence. Grounded in the Strong Ties Approach the object of study is to explore the relationship between social intelligence and organizational identification. Besides, the study aimed to determine whether the level of social intelligence and organizational identification vary or not according to the sector type. The study was designed with a quantitative research pattern and correlational research design. The sample is consisting of 306 public and private sector employees. The survey technique with a convenience sampling method was used to collect the data. The obtained data were investigated through statistical analysis software. Social intelligence was considered both as a whole and with its dimensions named as social information processing, social skills, and social awareness. According to the regression analysis results; social intelligence as a whole and social skills have a significant and positive contribution to predicting organizational identification. However, the effect of social information processing and social awareness on organizational identification is not significant. Moreover, independent samples t-test suggests that the social intelligence and social skills levels of private sector employees are higher than the same factor levels of the public sector. However, the level of employees' social information processing, social awareness, and organizational identification does not differ

according to the sector type. The research also offers several theoretical and practical implications.

Keywords: Social intelligence, organizational identification, sector type, SQ, OID.

1. INTRODUCTION

Since people are social assets, they need to meet both their physiological and psychological needs in order to survive (Doğan & Çetin, 2008). It can be said that the most important of these needs emerge within the social networks of people since every person needs the presence of another person (Mohoric & Taksic, 2016). However, they need to be able to correctly analyze the events, situations, and relationships in these environments in order to correctly perceive these kinds of needs that arise in social areas.

Social intelligence (SQ), which is one of the most important variables of achieving this, emerges as a situation that gains more importance, especially in business life. Since the social intelligence of individuals emerges as a distinctive feature that differentiates them from other individuals (Gulliford et al., 2019).

With the emergence of the concept of social intelligence, research questions in the field of psychology and organizational behavior have also increased gradually. Therefore, the social intelligence structure has been part of traditional discussions about intelligence (Pinto, Faria & Taveira, 2014). Scientific studies on social intelligence began in the 1920s with the works of Edward Thorndike. Many of these studies focused on the definition, evaluation and identification of socially competent behavior (Bar-On, 2006; Doll, 1935; Thorndike, 1920). When the development process of scientific researches related to social intelligence is analyzed, it is seen that the most important issue at this point is pertained to the emergence of social intelligence (Silvera, Martinussen & Dahl, 2001).

Social intelligence is defined as the ability to get along well with others and a range of practical skills to interact successfully in any setting (Albrecht, 2006). Social intelligence was also described as “the ability to understand men and women, boys and girls to act wisely in human relations” (Thorndike, 1920, p. 228). Some definitions of social intelligence underline the individual's cognitive characteristics and ability to understand other people, while other definitions about the concept address a more behavioral dimension, such as the ability to successfully interact with others (Barnes & Sternberg, 1989; Ford & Tisak, 1983).

With a brief definition, social intelligence has been recognized as the ability to handle interpersonal responsibilities and tasks more easily (Kaukiainen et al., 1999). Since social intelligence affects individuals in any field, their's social or private life and work relations are affected by it.

Organizational identification (OID) emerges as an ideal situation to be achieved in business life and means that employees perceive themselves as a whole with their organizations (Edwards, 2005; He & Brown, 2013). Identification in the organizational plane means that employees define themselves with a feature that is unique to their organization and this concept is of capital importance for the competitive advantage of the organization, also (Dutton, Dukerich & Harquail, 1994).

Organizational identification is an important variable that can be used to maintain the relationship between the employer and employee in a highly qualified manner in today's highly complex organizations (Epitropaki, 2013). On the other hand, organizational identification is a type of social identity that positively contributes to the needs of the individual, such as belonging, security and self-development (Kane, Magnusen & Perrewe, 2012).

The changes brought by the business world became more complicated with technological developments and being reflected also to the expectations of the organizations from their employees. Therefore, the necessity of having individuals with very different competencies came forward. Some of these competencies that individuals should have are an adaptation to change and innovation, agility and the ability to build strong relationships. These competencies enable the individual to make sense of what is happening around him and therefore to adapt to the organization.

Employee adaptation to the organization is a prerequisite for organizational identification. At this point, the function of social intelligence comes into play. As individuals' social intelligence levels increase, the process of making sense of various business relationships will accelerate. Therefore, it is thought that social intelligence can be an important variable in determining organizational identification.

Since organizational identification is an important variable for the efficiency and productivity of the organization, its relationship with many variables has been examined. However, there is no study in the literature examining the relationship between organizational

identification and social intelligence. This gap in the literature has emerged as an important deficiency. This study is designed to fill the relevant gap in the literature and to contribute to the prediction of similar studies. For this purpose, the research question of this study is on whether social intelligence has an impact on the organizational identification or not, and also does the degree of social intelligence, and organizational identification varies according to the sector type?

In the following sections of the study, first of all, the issues of social intelligence and organizational identification were explained. Then, the predicted relationship between these mentioned issues was explained based on the literature. Afterward, used methodology and the obtained findings were given. Finally, the results of the research were discussed in the last section and recommendations were provided to the managers and further researches.

2. THEORETICAL BACKGROUND AND HYPOTHESES

2.1. Social Intelligence

Considering Thorndike's (1920) work on social intelligence, it is seen that the concept of social intelligence is defined in two aspects: First, it is the ability to understand and manage people; the other is the skill to act skillfully in human relations. Its definition is extremely important in terms of revealing the differences between cognitive and behavioral elements and intelligent behavior (Kosmitzki & John, 1993).

Vernon (1933) describes the concept of social intelligence as the ability to connect people, to be aware of social issues, and to be able to predict the personality characteristics of unfamiliar people. According to Allport (1937), social intelligence is a special skill that allows individuals to accurately predict, evaluate and adapt to other interpersonal relationships.

Ford and Tisak (1983) explained social intelligence in a behavioral dimension as the ability to act in order to reach the target they have set and faced in social situations. Law, Wong and Song (2004) stated that the concept of social intelligence includes both internal and interpersonal intelligence. They stated that internal intelligence involves the ability of the individual to make sense of their feelings and thoughts as the cause of their behavior. They also stated that interpersonal intelligence is the ability to predict the temperament, mood, and intentions of other individuals and to manage people accordingly.

When the definitions of social intelligence are examined, it is seen that the concept focuses on understanding the emotions (Goleman & Boyatzis, 2008; Keating, 1978; Marlowe, 1986). However, the concept of social intelligence can be considered as the ability to develop strategies on events as a matter of awareness of events and situations, as well as human relations skills by focusing on emotions (Doğan, Totan & Sapmaz, 2009).

Many researchers have classified the dimensions of social intelligence in different ways. In this study, social intelligence dimensions were considered according to the approach developed by Silvera and his colleagues (2001):

Social Information Processing: This dimension encompasses various qualifications such as the individual's understanding of himself/herself and others' feelings and thoughts, the ability to read body language, and to understand the wishes and expectations of others in interpersonal relations.

Social Skills: This dimension emphasizes that the individual understands the feelings and thoughts of others and can use this meaningfulness in their relations. In other words, social skills refer to the ability of individuals to be sociable and adapt to the environment in social environments.

Social Awareness: This dimension can be expressed as the adaptation of the individual to the rhythm of the environment. More clearly, it is the ability of an individual to act based on the conditions of the environment.

When the business life is taken into consideration in terms of sectoral differences, the private sector will have a more competitive environment compared to the public sector area. On the other hand, it is the fact that public sectoral jobs are more formal when compared to the private sector. Undoubtedly, these situations will lead to various differences in understanding the behaviors of others. Therefore, the importance of individual relations in the private sector is more important while the importance of institutional relations in the public sector is more prominent (Boyne, 2002). In this sense, it will be necessary to understand the behavior of others in the private sector, while the public sector will have a lower level of this necessity.

- H_1 : Social intelligence levels of employees differ according to sector type.
- H_{1a} : Social information processing of employees differ according to sector type.

- H_{1b} : Social skills levels of employees differ according to sector type.
- H_{1c} : Social awareness levels of employees differ according to sector type.

2.2. Organizational Identification

Organizations are undergoing various transformations in order to survive in today's destructive competitive conditions and to get over with this challenge. These transformations emerge as an organizational structure evolving from complex hierarchical structures to simple and open units (Dick et al., 2007). These new structures that emerged day by day increase the importance of the relationship between the organization and employees.

Therefore, organizations have come into different expectations in order to understand human resource which is their most important factor, and to increase their contribution to the organization. One of these expectations is the organizational identification that expresses the adaptation of the individual identities of the employees in a way that is compatible with the identity of the organization (Dutton et al., 1994; Polat & Meydan, 2010).

Organizational identification is an extremely important tool for the continuity of the organization (Yıldız, 2013). It consists of individual and organizational messages that provide a link between the values and objectives of the employees in the organization, providing an environment that reduces unclear roles within the organization (Miller et al., 2000).

Organizational identification refers to the relationship between the individual and organization by seeing the success and failure of the organization as his/her own success or failure (Mael & Ashforth, 1992). In other words, organizational identification is a structure for establishing a psychological tie between the organization and the individual (Puusa & Tolvanen, 2006). Based on another definition, organizational identification is the way in which employees express themselves with the characteristics of the organization (Dutton et al., 1994). In the light of all these definitions, it can be said that by means of the organizational identification, employees are integrated with their organizations and they are satisfied with this integration.

Similarly, when the business life is taken into consideration with the sectoral differences, the existence of different workflows and practices in the private sector area necessary an adaptation to more people with different characteristics. Therefore, the levels of organizational identification of private-sector employees will be higher than those of public sector employees. As a matter of fact, the studies conducted on this subject indicate that the

levels of organizational identification of private-sector employees are higher than those of public sector employees (Celik & Yildiz, 2018).

- H_2 : Organizational identification levels of employees differ according to sector type.

2.3. Relationship between the Variables

The relationship between social intelligence and organizational identification can be explained by the Strong Ties Approach. Unlike the theory of the Strength of Weak Ties (Granovetter, 1973) in which actors do not need to be socially qualified, often do not involve frequent interactions and tend to create relationships based on formal and distant relations between the parties; the Strong Ties Approach suggests that individuals tend to create strong bonds that are often socially qualified (Bourdieu, 1986).

The Strong Ties Approach which is a traditional approach is used to understand the relationship between social networks, assess the effectiveness of networks and determine the relationships that will benefit actors (Coleman, 1988; Podolny, 2001; Sözen & Gürbüz, 2017). According to this approach, actors in social groups have the same common values and beliefs with others in the group. They agree on acceptable and unacceptable behavior (Akyazı & Karadal, 2017). This harmony creates trust among individuals, groups, and organizations (Bekmezci, 2017).

In the literature, it has been stated that strong ties create social support and trust (Ada & Ada, 2010), increase knowledge sharing and hereby reduce uncertainties (Kraatz, 1998), makes easier to predict people's behavior (Burt, 2005; Sözen & Esatoğlu, 2010). It also provides organizational identification (Bekmezci, 2017). This point exactly guides the relationship between social intelligence and organizational identification. When considered from this point of view, as the level of individuals' social intelligence increases, the ability to predict other people's behavior will also be increased. This will accelerate the achievement of common values and beliefs which are the requirements of the Strong Ties Approach. These situations will eventually bring about organizational identification. In other words, people with a high level of social intelligence will be able to anticipate other people's attitudes and behaviors, that is, they will tend to show behaviors that overlap with them. All of these will enable employees within the organization to resemble each other and this will create strong ties as well. In the end, employees will be identified with the organization.

Although there is no study examining the relationship between social intelligence and organizational identification in the relevant literature, there are some studies that examined the relationship between different types of intelligence and organizational identification. According to these studies, it has been determined that emotional intelligence has positive relations with organizational identification (Yılmaz, 2018; Zeng, Chen & Chen, 2014). It is not wrong to think that social intelligence will show a positive relationship with organizational identification when it is considered that the basis of emotional intelligence and social intelligence expresses the ability of human beings to be aware of their own behaviors and other people's behaviors.

The relations and scope among social intelligence and organizational identification can also be considered from another perspective. In this context, it is possible to predict the relationship between social intelligence and identification through the antecedents of organizational identification. It is a generally accepted situation that organizational socialization is a positive antecedent of organizational identification in the literature (Aliyev & Isik, 2014; Lee, 2013). That is to say that the individuals who socialize as a result of the learning process will be identified in their organization. In this context, in a study investigating the impact of social intelligence on organizational socialization, it was found that social intelligence was a positive antecedent of the organizational socialization (Çavus, Pekkan & Develi, 2019). As mentioned before, considering that organizational socialization is an antecedent of organizational identification, it can be assumed that social intelligence will have a positive relationship with organizational identification.

- H_3 : Social intelligence will be positively related to organizational identification.
- H_{3a} : Social information processing will be positively related to organizational identification.
- H_{3b} : Social skills will be positively related to organizational identification.
- H_{3c} : Social awareness will be positively related to organizational identification.

3. MATERIALS AND METHODS

3.1. Sample and Procedure

The research was conducted within the scope of quantitative research pattern and correlational research design. In this context, the survey technique with a convenience

sampling method was used to collect the data. The obtained data were investigated through IBM SPSS and IBM SPSS Amos statistical analysis software.

In order to reach an adequate sample size, the rule used to reach at least 10 times more participants than the total number of expressions of the scales was taken into consideration (Everitt, 1975). Online questionnaires were delivered to each participant with a detailed message description of the purpose and significance of the research.

The sample of the research is consisting of 306 public and private sector employees in different occupational groups and cities in Turkey ($n = 306$). The demographic characteristics of the participants are as follows: 188 employees (61.4%) of 306 participants were male and 118 employees (38.6%) were female. 151 employees (49.3%) of the participants constitute the biggest share with the 26-35 age group. 193 employees (63.1%) of the participants are educated at the bachelor level. This ratio is followed by 52 employees (17.0%) with a master's level, 25 employees (8.2%) with associate level, 21 employees (6.9%) with PhD level and 15 employees (4.9%) with high school level. On account of the organization type, the participants consisted of the public sector by 175 employees (57.2%) and private sector employees by 131 employees (42.8%). Finally, the majority of the employees with working experience of 2-8 years (50.3% / 154 employees) in the sense of working time in the current workplace, and the total working time in the working life is composed of employees who have working experience in the range of 2-8 years (38.6% / 118 employees).

3.2. Measures

The Tromso Social Intelligence Scale (TSIS) was used to measure the social intelligence of employees developed by Silvera, Martinussen and Dahl (2001) and made Turkish validation by Doğan and Çetin (2009). The scale has 3 dimensions and 21 items. The name of these dimensions is social information processing (8 items), social skills (6 items) and social awareness (7 items).

To measure the perception of employees towards organizational identification the scale was used developed by Mael and Ashforth (1992) and made Turkish validation by Tüzün (2006). The scale consists of 6 items and 1 dimension.

The scales are evaluated with the Likert-type scale from 1-strictly disagree to 5-strictly agree. In order to determine the demographic characteristics of the employees in the

introduction of the survey; questions such as gender, age, education level, sector type, working time in the current institution and total working time in business life are included.

4. FINDINGS

4.1. Preliminary Data Analysis

At this stage, first of all, missing value analysis was performed. As a result of this analysis, 6 questionnaire forms were excluded from the observation. Then the outlier analysis was performed. In the outlier analysis using the Mahalanobis Distance method, 15 questionnaires were excluded from the observation because they were distant from the center of the subjects at the %1 statistical significance level (Mahalanobis, 1936).

After removing the problematic questionnaire forms, the final number of participants in the data set is 306 ($n = 306$). Besides, it was checked whether the obtained data have a normal distribution or not, to determine the types of analysis (parametric or non-parametric) to be used in the research. In order to determine the normal distribution, the skewness and kurtosis values of each expression were examined.

According to the findings, the biggest skewness value is -1.27 and the biggest kurtosis value is 1.94. It was concluded that the data showed normal distribution because the skewness and kurtosis values were within ± 2 threshold values (George & Mallery, 2010). For this reason, parametric analyses were used in this study.

Another issue that needs to be checked before examining the data obtained in quantitative research is the common method variance problem. The common method variance is a problem that causes measurement errors in the relationships between the observed variables and therefore needs to be checked. One of the most frequently used methods to check the possible common method variance problem in the data set is Harman's single factor test (Podsakoff & Organ, 1986). Accordingly, all items used in the questionnaire were analyzed by the principal component analysis with no rotation. According to the findings, the items were not collected in one dimension and showed a multidimensional structure consisting of 6 dimensions. In addition, to be able to obtain a single and general factor, when the factor number was fixed to 1 in the principal component analysis, it was found that the only factor that emerged was explaining a low portion corresponding to 21.55% of the total variance, not the majority ($s^2 < .50$). According to these results, it is seen that the possible

common method deviation in the data set does not constitute a problem (Podsakoff et al., 2003).

4.2. Validity Analysis

In order to determine, to what extent the observed variables represent the latent variables and to determine whether the sample complies with the theoretical model of the study or not, confirmatory factor analysis is performed. Since the data collected from 306 employees have a normal distribution, the covariance matrix is formed using the maximum likelihood method (Kline, 2011). Four observed variables of the social intelligence scale and one observed variable of the organizational identification scale were excluded from the measurement models due to the low factor loading. The results of the confirmatory factor analyses are shown in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Results of the confirmatory factor analysis

Measures	χ^2/df	CFI	GFI	IFI	TLI	RMR	RMSEA
	< 5	> .90	> .90	> .90	> .90	< .08	< .08
Social Intelligence (second order)	2.03	.917	.917	.918	.902	.049	.058
Social Intelligence (first order)	2.03	.917	.917	.918	.902	.049	.058
Organizational Identification	2.73	.983	.986	.983	.958	.033	.075
Overall (measurement model)	1.83	.911	.903	.913	.900	.058	.052

Note. $n = 306$. χ^2/df : Chi-square/degrees of freedom, CFI: Comparative fit index, GFI: Goodness of fit index, IFI: Incremental fit index, TLI: Tucker-Lewis index, RMR: Root mean square residual, RMSEA: Root mean square error of approximation.

The goodness of fit indices obtained from confirmatory factor analyses shows that the structures of the scales are compatible with the data, and also the predicted theoretical model for the relationship between social intelligence and organizational identification is confirmed by the obtained data (Bentler, 1988; Brown, 2014; Hu & Bentler, 1999; Kline, 2011; Tabachnick & Fidell, 2013). In the confirmatory factor analyses, also it was seen that the social intelligence scale had the same goodness of fit indices in the second and first orders.

4.3. Reliability Analysis

To determine the internal consistency of the items, reliability analysis was performed via two different methods. According to this, the Cronbach's alpha (α) and composite reliability (CR) coefficients were calculated. The coefficients of the overall social intelligence and organizational identification are, in a row, $\alpha = .80$, CR = .91 and $\alpha = .78$, CR = .79. Besides, the coefficients of the social intelligence dimensions which are social information processing, social skills and social awareness are, in a row, $\alpha = .80$, CR = .80; $\alpha = .86$, CR =

.86; $\alpha = .72$, $CR = .71$. These coefficients ($\alpha \geq .70$; $CR \geq .70$) suggest that all scales have internal consistency reliability (Nunnally, 1978; Raykov, 1997).

4.4. Independent Samples t Test

To test the H_1 , H_{1a} , H_{1b} , H_{1c} , and H_2 hypotheses, that is, to determine whether the level of social intelligence and dimensions and also organizational identification vary or not according to the sector type independent sample t-test was performed. According to the results of Levene's test in all variables, it was observed that the variances are homogeneous ($p > .05$). For this reason, the values of the assumption of homogeneity of variances are taken into account. The other results are shown in Table 2 below.

Table 2: Results of the t-test

Variables	Sector Type	n	M	SD	df	t	p
Social Intelligence	Public	175	3.80	.46	304	-2.00	.045
	Private	131	3.90	.42			
Social Information Processing	Public	175	3.89	.51	304	-1.83	.068
	Private	131	4.00	.48			
Social Skills	Public	175	3.92	.80	304	-2.43	.015
	Private	131	4.15	.79			
Social Awareness	Public	175	3.66	.61	304	-.66	.508
	Private	131	3.71	.66			
Organizational Identification	Public	175	3.80	.77	304	-.34	.730
	Private	131	3.84	.84			

Note. n: Number of cases, M: Mean, SD: Standard deviation, df: Degrees of freedom, t: The t statistics, p: Statistical significance level.

According to the results, the significance value shows that social intelligence and social skills are statistically significant ($p < .05$). However, social information processing and social awareness aren't statistically significant ($p > .05$). When the mean and standard deviation values are considered; the highest level of social intelligence is observed in the private sector employees ($M = 3.90$, $SD = .42$) and the public sector employees ($M = 3.80$, $SD = .46$), respectively. Similarly, the highest level of social skills is observed in the private sector employees ($M = 4.15$, $SD = .79$) and the public sector employees ($M = 3.92$, $SD = .80$), respectively. Although the difference in the mean values was not large, it was found out that the social intelligence and social skills level of the private sector employees were higher than the public sector employees. *The H_1 and H_{1b} hypotheses are accepted while H_{1a} and H_{1c} hypotheses are rejected.*

Besides, the significance value of the organizational identification shows that the t-test was not statistically significant ($p > .05$). In other words, the levels of employees towards

organizational identification do not differ according to the sector type. *The H₂ hypothesis is rejected.*

4.5. Descriptive Statistics and Correlation Analysis

Descriptive statistics analysis was performed to reveal the structure of the sample in terms of the variables examined in the research. On the other hand, Pearson correlation analysis was performed to determine the relations for social intelligence and its dimensions with organizational identification together. The results are shown in Table 3 below.

Table 3: Means, standard deviations and correlations of variables

Variables	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5
1 Social Intelligence	3.85	.44	1				
2 Social Information Processing	3.94	.50	.76**	1			
3 Social Skills	4.02	.80	.64**	.48**	1		
4 Social Awareness	3.68	.63	.75**	.25**	.17**	1	
5 Organizational Identification	3.82	.80	.23**	.21**	.24**	.09	1

Note. M: Mean, SD: Standard deviation

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$

It is understood from the results of the descriptive statistics that the participants perceived the items of social skills, social information processing, social intelligence, organizational identification and social awareness scales at a high level, respectively. Besides, Pearson correlation analysis results indicate that there are statistically significant, low level and positive relationships among all variables ($p < .01$, $r < .30$), except for the social awareness and organizational identification ($p > .05$) relations (Ratner, 2017).

4.6. Regression Analysis

To test the H_3 , H_{3a} , H_{3b} , H_{3c} hypotheses, that is, to determine the predictive status of social intelligence and its dimensions on organizational identification regression analyses was performed. The results are shown in Table 4 below.

Table 4: Results of the regression analysis

Model	Independent Variables	R ²	Adj. R ²	F	p	β	DW	VIF
1	Social Intelligence	.055	.052	17.735	.000	.235***	1.692	1.000
	Social Information Processing					.120		1.367
2	Social Skills	.073	.064	7.970	.000	.180**	1.676	1.314
	Social Awareness					.036		1.074

Note. The dependent variable of the models is organizational identification. β: Standardized Beta coefficient, R²: Multiple correlation squared, Adj. R²: Adjusted multiple correlation squared, F: The F-statistic, p: Statistical significance level, DW: Durbin-Watson statistic, VIF: Variance inflation factor.

* $p < .05$, ** $p < .01$, *** $p < .001$

The results of the first regression model showed that it is possible to estimate the organizational identification by the overall social intelligence ($F_{(df=1.304)} = 17.735$, $p < .001$).

The multiple correlation squared suggests that overall social intelligence is predicted 6% of this model ($R^2 = .055$). Besides, according to standardized beta coefficients overall social intelligence has a positive effect on organizational identification ($\beta = .23, p < .001$). Besides, it can be said that based on the second model it is possible to estimate the organizational identification by dimensions of the social intelligence ($F_{(df=3,302)} = 7.970, p < .001$).

The adjusted multiple correlation squared of the second model shows that dimensions of social intelligence are predicted 6% of this model ($Adj. R^2 = .064$). Moreover, standardized beta coefficients indicate that social skills have a positive effect on organizational identification ($\beta = .18, p < .01$). The standardized beta values belong to other dimensions are not statistically significant ($p > .05$).

Furthermore, according to the variance inflation factor (VIF) coefficients and Durbin-Watson (DW) statistics, there weren't multicollinearity problem ($VIF < 5$) and serial correlation problem ($DW < 2$) in the models (Durbin & Watson, 1971; O'Brien, 2007).

According to all findings; while overall social intelligence and social skills have a positive effect on organizational identification, the effect of social information processing and social awareness on organizational identification are insignificant. *The H_3 and H_{3b} hypotheses are accepted while H_{3a} and H_{3c} hypotheses are rejected.*

5. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

This study aims to determine the predictive status of social intelligence and dimensions on organizational identification. For this purpose, quantitative research on the public and private sector employees in Turkey was carried out. The correlation and regression analysis were used to determine the relationships between social intelligence and organizational identification through statistical analysis software. As a result of the investigations, explanatory findings have been reached.

Social intelligence comprises some sub-dimensions according to the used scale in research which are social information processing, social skills, and social awareness. According to the results, overall social intelligence and social skills have a significant and positive contribution to predicting organizational identification. But, the effect of social knowledge processing and social awareness on organizational identification aren't significant.

On the other hand, it was tried to determine whether social intelligence and its dimensions and also organizational identification differ or not according to the sector type which was public and private. According to this, it has been revealed that social intelligence and social skills levels of private-sector employees were higher than those of the public sector, however, the level of employees' social information processing, social awareness, and organizational identification does not differ according to the sector type.

The obtained results are overlapping with the Strong Ties Approach that explains the relationships between the study' variables. Since, as stated previously, according to the Strong Ties Approach individuals will transform into a homogenous structure by doing common sharing, and that this will make it easier for individuals to predict each other's wishes and behaviors and thus, individuals will show organizational identification.

At this point, what is tested with this study is the foresight that social intelligence will provide a positive contribution to all these processes. Eventually, it was determined that social intelligence is a positive predictor of organizational identification. Only social knowledge processing and social awareness which are dimensions of social intelligence did not conform to this structure. This situation can be explained by the fact that the social skills dimension of social intelligence is an action-oriented, dynamic dimension; but the social information processing and social awareness dimensions are more thought-oriented and static.

The theoretical contribution of the study is obvious, because of the relationship between social intelligence and organizational identification has been examined for the first time. In the study, the reason why social intelligence will affect organizational identification is explained in detail with the Strong Ties Approach. As a result of the research conducted within the scope of the study, this theoretical approach is proved. Thus, a theoretical contribution was provided to the Strong Ties Approach.

This study has originality in terms of practical implications due to contributing to business life. It has been determined that social intelligence is important in organizational identification. Therefore, it has emerged that social intelligence should be seen as an organizational gain. In this sense, taking into account the level of social intelligence of the employees in the practices to be realized in order to realize the organizational identification, especially in the recruitment process, will be a profitable approach for the organization and all stakeholders.

This study was limited by the characteristics of the sample. Besides, the use of the convenience sampling method in the research adversely affects the generalizability of the research results. Therefore, it is recommended to use random sampling methods in the future. On the other hand, it is thought that more explicit findings can be achieved when focusing on a specific organizational culture or a specific occupational group. Moreover, it is possible to generalize the research results to the universe by calculating the ideal sample size during the sampling process. Furthermore, if this research model is conducted through qualitative research design, a more in-depth perspective can be provided to the relationship between social intelligence and organizational identification.

Footnote: This study is the revised and enlarged version of the proceeding (Cavus, Pekkan & Develi, 2017) published in the proceeding book of the "Third International Scientific-Business Conference Leadership & Management: Integrated Politics of Research and Innovations" on December 14, 2017 in Belgrade, Serbia.

REFERENCES

- Ada, S., & Ada, Ş. (2010). A meta analytic study on the importance of weak ties in organizations. **Balikesir University Journal of Social Sciences Institute**, 13(23), 115-128.
- Akyazi, T. E., & Karadal, H. (2017). Girişimcilik ve sosyal ağlar: sosyal ağ analizi yönetimi ile aksaray organize sanayi bölgesindeki işletmelerin girişimcilik haritasının oluşturulması (Entrepreneurship and social networks: building the entrepreneurial map of the firms in aksaray organized industrial zone through social network analysis). **LAÜ Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi**, 8(2), 168-192.
- Albrecht, K. (2006). **Social intelligence: The new science of success**. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass A Wiley Imprint.
- Allport, G. W. (1937). **Personality: A psychological interpretation**. New York: Henry Holt and Company.
- Aliyev, Y., & Işık, M. (2014). Örgütsel sosyalleşme ve örgütsel özdeşleşme arasındaki ilişki: Bir araştırma (An examination of the relationship between organizational socialization and organizational identification). **Erciyes Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi**, 2(27), 131-149.
- Bar-On, R. (2006). The Bar-On model of emotional-social intelligence (ESI). **Psicothema**, 18(suplemento), 13-25.
- Barnes, M. L., & Sternberg, R. J. (1989). Social intelligence and decoding of nonverbal cues. **Intelligence**, 13(3), 263-287.
- Bekmezci, M. (2017). **Yönetim ve strateji: 101 teori ve yaklaşım (Management and strategy: 101 theories and approaches)**. In Ö. Turunç & H. Turgut (Eds.), (p. 165-217). Ankara: Siyasal Kitabevi.
- Bentler, P. M. (1988). **Causal modeling via structural equation systems**. In **Handbook of multivariate experimental psychology** (p. 317-335). Boston, MA: Springer.

Boyne, G. A. (2002). Public and private management: What's the difference? **Journal of Management Studies**, 39(1), 97-122.

Brown, T. A. (2014). **Confirmatory factor analysis for applied research**. New York: Guilford Publications.

Bourdieu, P. (1986). **The forms of capital**. In J.G. Richardson (Ed.), Handbook of theory and research for the sociology of education in (p. 241-258). New York: Greenwood

Burt, R. S. (2005). **Brokerage and closure: An introduction to social capital**. USA: Oxford University Press.

Coleman, J. S. (1988). Social capital in the creation of human capital. **American Journal of Sociology**, 94(supplement), 95-120.

Cavus, M. F., Pekkan, N. U., & Develi, A. (2017). A research on explore the effects of social intelligence on organizational identification. *Third International Scientific-Business Conference Leadership & Management: Integrated Politics of Research and Innovations (LIMEN) Conference Proceedings (pp. 106-111)*, Belgrade: All in One Print Center

Çavuş, M. F., Pekkan, N. Ü., & Develi, A. (2019). Örgütsel sosyalleşmeye yeni bir öncül: Sosyal zeka (A new antecedent to organizational socialization: Social intelligence). **Pamukkale Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi**, 36, 259-272.

Çelik, M., & Yıldız, B. (2018). Hemşirelerde mesleki bağlılık, özdeşleşme ve işten ayrılma niyeti ilişkisi: Kamu sektörü ve özel sektör karşılaştırması (Occupational commitment, identification and intention to leave of nurses: Public sector and private sector comparison). **Kastamonu Üniversitesi İktisadi ve İdari Bilimler Fakültesi Dergisi**, 20(2), 47-75.

Doğan, T., & Çetin, B. (2008). Üniversite öğrencilerinin sosyal zekâ düzeylerinin depresyon ve bazı değişkenlerle ilişkisinin incelenmesi (The investigation of relationship between social intelligence, depression and some variables at university students). **Uluslararası İnsan Bilimleri Dergisi**, 5(2), 1-19.

Doğan, T., & Çetin, B. (2009) Tromso sosyal zeka ölçeği Türkçe formunun faktör yapısı, geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışması (The validity, reliability and factorial structure of the Turkish version of the Tromso social intelligence scale). **Educational Sciences: Theory and Practice**, 7(1), 241-268.

Doğan, T., Totan, T., & Sapmaz, F. (2009). Üniversite öğrencilerinde benlik saygısı ve sosyal zeka (Self-esteem and social intelligence in university students). **Sakarya Üniversitesi Eğitim Fakültesi Dergisi**, 17(May), 235-247.

Dick, R. V., Hirst, G., Grojean, M. W., & Wieseke, J. (2007). Relationships between leader and follower organizational identification and implications for follower attitudes and behaviour. **Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology**, 80(1), 133-150.

Doll, E. A. (1935). A generic scale of social maturity. **American Journal of Orthopsychiatry**, 5(2), 180-190.

Durbin, J. & Watson, G. S. (1971). Testing for serial correlation in least squares regression, III. **Biometrika**, 58(1), 1-19.

Dutton, J. E., Dukerich, J. M., & Harquail, C. V. (1994). Organizational images and member identification. **Administrative Science Quarterly**, 39(2), 239-263.

- Edwards, M. R. (2005). Organizational identification: A conceptual and operational review. **International Journal of Management Reviews**, 7(4), 207-230.
- Epitropaki, O. (2013). A multi-level investigation of psychological contract breach and organizational identification through the lens of perceived organizational membership: Testing a moderated-mediated model. **Journal of Organizational Behavior**, 34(1), 65-86.
- Everitt, B. S. (1975). Multivariate Analysis: The need for data, and other problems. **The British Journal of Psychiatry**, 126(3), 237-240.
- Ford, M. E., & Tisak, M. S. (1983). A further search for social intelligence. **Journal of Educational Psychology**, 75(2), 196-206.
- George, D., & Mallery, M. (2010). **SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple guide and reference. (17.0 update)**. Boston: Pearson.
- Goleman, D., & Boyatzis, R. (2008). Social intelligence and the biology of the leadership. **Harvard Business Review**, 86(9), 74-81.
- Granovetter, M. (1973). The strength of weak ties. **American Journal of Sociology**, 78(6), 1360-1380.
- Gulliford, L., Morgan, B., Hemming, E., & Abbott, J. (2019). Gratitude, self-monitoring and social intelligence: A prosocial relationship? **Current Psychology**, 38), 1021-1032.
- He, H., & Brown, A. D. (2013). Organizational identity and organizational identification: A review of the literature and suggestions for future research. **Group & Organization Management**, 38(1), 3-35.
- Hu, L. T., & Bentler, P. M. (1999). Cutoff Criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. **Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal**, 6(1), 1-55.
- Kane, R. E., Magnusen, M. J., & Perrewe, P. L. (2012). Differential effects of identification on extra-role behavior. **Career Development International**, 17(1), 25-42.
- Kaukiainen, A., Bjoerkqvist, K., Lagerspetz, K., Oesterman, K., Salmivalli, C., Rothberg, S., & Ahlbom, A. (1999). The relationship between social intelligence, empathy and three types of aggression. **Aggressive Behavior**, 25(2), 81-89.
- Keating, D. P. (1978). A search for social intelligence. **Journal of Educational Psychology**, 70(2), 218-223.
- Kline, R. B., (2011). **Principles and practice of structural equation modelling**. London: The Guilford Press.
- Kozmitzki, C., & John, O. P. (1993). The implicit use of explicit conceptions of social intelligence. **Personality and Individual Differences**, 15(1), 11-23.
- Kraatz, M. S. (1998), Learning by association? Interorganizational networks and adaptation to environmental change. **Academy of Management Journal**, 41(6), 621-643.
- Law, K. S., Wong, C. S., & Song, L. J. (2004). The construct and criterion validity of emotional intelligence and its potential utility for management studies. **Journal of Applied Psychology**, 89(3), 483.
- Lee, H. W. (2013). Locus of control, socialization, and organizational identification. **Management Decision**, 51(5), 1047-1055.

- Mael, F., & Ashforth, B. E. (1992). Alumni and their alma mater: A partial test of the reformulated model of organizational identification. **Journal of Organizational Behavior**, 13(2), 103-123.
- Mahalanobis, P. C. (1936). On the generalized distance in statistics. **Proceedings of the National Institute of Sciences (Calcutta)**, 2), 49-55.
- Marlowe, H. A. (1986). Social intelligence: Evidence for multidimensionality and construct independence. **Journal of Educational Psychology**, 78(1), 52-58.
- Miller, V. D., Allen, M., Casey, M. K., & Johnson, J. R. (2000). Reconsidering the organizational identification questionnaire. **Management Communication Quarterly**, 13(4), 626-658.
- Mohoric, T., & Taksic, V. (2016). Emotional understanding as a predictor of socio-emotional functioning and school achievement in adolescence. **Psihologija**, 49(4), 357-374.
- Nunnally, J. C. (1978). **Psychometric theory**. New York: McGraw-Hill
- O'brien, R. M. (2007). A caution regarding rules of thumb for variance inflation factors. **Quality & Quantity**, 41(5), 673-690.
- Pinto, J. C., Faria, L., & Taveira, M. C. (2014). Social intelligence in Portuguese students: Differences according to the school grade. **Social and Behavioral Sciences**, 116, 56-62. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.01.168
- Podolny, J. M. (2001). Networks as the pipes and prisms of the market. **American Journal of Sociology**, 107(1), 33-60.
- Podsakoff, P. M. & Organ, D. W. (1986). Self-reports in organizational research: Problems and prospects. **Journal of Management**, 12(4), 531-544.
- Podsakoff, P. M., Mackenzie, S. B., Lee, J. Y. & Podsakoff, N. P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. **Journal of Applied Psychology**, 88(5), 879-903.
- Polat, M., & Meydan, C. H. (2010). Örgütsel özdeşleşmenin sinizm ve işten ayrılma niyeti ile ilişkisi üzerine bir araştırma (An empirical study on the relationship of organizational identification with cynicism and intention to leave). **Savunma Bilimleri Dergisi**, 9(1), 145-172.
- Puusa A., & Tolvanen U. (2006). Organizational identity and trust. **Electronic Journal of Business Ethics and Organizational Studies**, 11(2), 29-33.
- Ratner, B. (2017). **Statistical and machine-learning data mining: Techniques for better predictive modeling and analysis of big data**. London: Chapman and Hall/CRC Press.
- Raykov, T. (1997). Estimation of composite reliability for congeneric measures. **Applied Psychological Measurement**, 21(2), 173-184.
- Silvera, D., Martinussen, M., & Dahl, T. I. (2001). The Tromso social intelligence scale, a self-report measure of social intelligence. **Scandinavian Journal of Psychology**, 42(4), 313-319.
- Sözen, H. C., & Esatoğlu, A. E. (2010). Sosyal ağ kuramının bakış açısıyla örgütlerde çatışma yönetimi (Conflict management in organizations through social network theories). **Sarem Stratejik Araştırmalar Dergisi**, 8(15), 109-134.

Sözen, H. C. & Gürbüz, S. (2017). Örgütsel ağlar (Organizational network). In H. C. Sözen & N. Basım (Eds.), **Örgüt kuramları (Theories of organization)** (p. 317-341). İstanbul: Beta Basım.

Tabachnick, B. G. & Fidell, L. S. (2013). **Using multivariate statistics**. Boston: Pearson.

Thorndike, E. L. (1920). Intelligence and its uses. **Harper's Magazine**, 140, 227-235.

Tüzün, İ. K. (2006). **Örgütsel güven, örgütsel kimlik ve örgütsel özdeşleşme ilişkisi; uygulamalı bir çalışma (Relationship between organizational trust, organizational identity and organizational identification; An applied study)**. Unpublished Doctoral Dissertation, Gazi University, Ankara, Turkey: Institute of Social Science.

Vernon, P. E. (1933). Some characteristics of the good judge of personality. **Journal of Social Psychology**, 4(1), 42-57.

Yildiz, K. (2013). Analysis of the relation of teachers' organizational identification and organizational communication. **Educational Sciences: Theory & Practice**, 13(1), 264-272.

Yılmaz, F. (2018). Çağrı merkezi çalışanlarında duygusal zekânın örgütsel özdeşleşme üzerindeki etkileri (Impact of emotional intelligence on organizational identification for call center personnel). **Akademik Bakış Uluslararası Hakemli Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi**, 67, 73-85.

Zeng, Y., Chen, X., & Chen, Y. (2014, September). Impact of emotional intelligence on emotional labor strategy: The mediating effects of general self-efficacy and organizational identification. In **Proceedings of 3rd International Conference on Computer Science and Service System** (p. 207-210). France: Atlantis Press.