Available online at http://www.journalcra.com

International Journal of Current Research
Vol. 10, Issue, 05, pp.69928-69935, May, 2018

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF CURRENT RESEARCH

ISSN: 0975-833X

RESEARCH ARTICLE

IMPACT OF ACADEMIC ACHIEVEMENT ON MORAL INTELLIGENCE DIMENSIONS, LEADERSHIP SKILLS, ACHIEVEMENT MOTIVATION AND SELF-EFFICACY AMONG SAUDI MIDDLE SCHOOLS' GIFTED STUDENTS

***Sameer A M Abdulrazaq, Aswati Binti Hamzah and Zainudin Mohd Isa**

School of Education Studies, Universiti Sains Malaysia, 11800, Penang, Malaysia

ARTICLE INFO

Article History:
Received 24th February, 2018
Received in revised form
19th March, 2018
Accepted 09th April, 2018
Published online 31st May, 2018

Key words:
Academic Achievement,
Moral Intelligence, Achievement Motivation,
Self-Efficacy, Leadership Skills,
Gifted Students, Saudi Arabia.

**Corresponding author:*

ABSTRACT

Objective: To evaluate the impact of academic achievement on moral intelligence dimensions, leadership skills, achievement motivation and self-efficacy among Saudi Middle Schools' Gifted Students. **Methods:** This was a cross sectional study conducted among Saudi middle schools' gifted students in Makkah, Saudi Arabia. The study explored the moral intelligence, leadership skill achievement motivation and self-efficacy of gifted students using a validated and piloted self-administered questionnaire. Simple random sampling technique was used to select 122 out of 733 male gifted students in 89 schools in Makkah, Saudi Arabia. Data was analysed using SPSS. **Results:** The study included 46, 42, and 34 first, second and third level middle school students respectively. The highest academic achievement was A+ which represents 60.7%, followed by A- (27.9%), B+ (9%) and B- (2.5%). The students demonstrated moderate level of moral intelligence dimensions, leadership skills, achievement motivation and self-efficacy. The leadership skills are as follows: B- (156.33 ± 26.690); B+ (163.27 ± 13.951); A- (171.32 ± 19.957); A+ (174.04 ± 17.983). ANOVA tests revealed that there were no significant differences based on the academic achievements (P = 0.140). Self-efficacy mean rank for B-, B+, A- and A+ academic achievement were (23.50); (52.82); (64.76) and (62.83) respectively. This implies that students who had A- academic achievement had higher self-efficacy than others; however, this difference was not significant (0.210). Similarly, there were no significant (P = 0.452) differences in the achievement motivation. Students who had A+ had higher mean rank (64.24), followed by A- (57.26), B- (49.83) and B+ (48.91). The overall score of moral intelligence domain was similar across the four levels of academic achievement. Students who had A+ had the highest mean rank (63.75), followed by A- (61.46), B+ (56.18) and B- (26.00); P = 0.311. **Conclusion:** Academic achievement had no significant impact on moral intelligence dimensions, leadership skills, achievement motivation and self-efficacy among Saudi Middle Schools' Gifted Students.

Citation: Sameer A M Abdulrazaq, Aswati Binti Hamzah and Zainudin Mohd Isa, 2018. "Impact of academic achievement on moral intelligence dimensions, leadership skills, achievement motivation and self-efficacy among Saudi middle schools' gifted students", *International Journal of Current Research*, 10, (05), 69928-69935.

INTRODUCTION

Giftedness is considered as a blessing bestowed upon a few individuals from Allah, the Almighty Creator. These individuals if recognized and nurtured attain unusual excellence and exhibit superiority in one or more aspect of life. People who are gifted are extremely endowed with talents and eventually become influential scientists, philosophers, inventors, reformers, and innovators that drive human civilization (Al-Surur, 2003). In humans, moral intelligence is a key to central intelligence because it serves as a compass for other forms of intelligence (Ackerman, Beier and Boyle, 2002). Thus, Moral intelligence encompasses identifying problems, setting targets, choosing and taking appropriate actions, and persevering (Lennick and Keil, 2008). Borba (2005) and Pana (2006) posited that moral quality that encompass compassion, conscience, discipline, reverence, benevolence, forbearance and justice (Borba, 2001). Gedney (1999) concluded that intelligence is a predictor of good leadership skills although it cannot be inferred that smart individuals almost always emerge as the best and most efficient leaders. Intelligence and leadership are qualities that are correlated (Kouzes and Posner, 2003). Leadership skills are traits imbued in gifted individuals (Chan, 2000; Bisland, 2004). Leadership qualities and achievement motivation has consistently been included in the definition of gifted students (Stephens and Karnes, 2000). Leadership skills of gifted students as a research discipline appeals many researchers in this field (Rahimi, 2011; McGregor, 2010; Davis and Rimm, 2004). In Saudi Arabia, the researcher observed that there is an increased focus on the concept of giftedness and gifted students as demonstrated in recent studies.

In fact, Saudi Arabian researchers have studied the concepts of giftedness and ways of recognizing gifted students at schools and universities. In addition, educational policies have provided support towards designing special curriculum and programs (Al-Bawardi, 1988). Teachers and parents of gifted students participate in developing moral, psychological, social and spiritual aspects of the student's life. The students are taught learning, leadership skills, achievement motivation and other abilities (Jarwan, 2011). However, Saudi middle schools' gifted students are confronted with several challenges that affect their achievement motivation, hinder their ability to develop leadership skills and the overall outcome of learning.

Rahimi (2011), McGregor (2010), and Clarken (2009) posited that there is a significant correlation between moral intelligence and leadership skill and successful leaders are certainly presented with moral choices. Beheshtifar (2011) also concluded that moral intelligence contributes to the development of leadership skills. Najafian (2011) indicates that increase in moral intelligence results in a corresponding increase in achievement motivation among gifted students. Actually, students have impact on creating students' high moral intelligence and desirable achievement motivation. Virtues of moral intelligence are missing in Saudi Arabian gifted education program. These virtues include empathy, conscience, self-control, respect, kindness, tolerance and fairness need to be inculcated in the mind of gifted students. There is need also for gifted students to assess and prioritize needs of each dimension of moral intelligence and to practice leadership (Borba, 2001). Therefore, these virtues are important in forming moral intelligence especially when related to leadership skill for gifted students. This is because gifted students need to be taught the ability to regulate their thoughts and actions to be good leaders expected to be successful in giving counsel and making decisions, and promotes moral intelligence among Saudi community (Lennick and Kiel, 2008). The dimensions of moral intelligence are important parts of Islamic virtues. Building positive relationship between human in real life is an important values. This lead human being to good behaviour distinguishing what is right from what is wrong and avoid bad things and do the desirable deeds (Nasr, 2002). In addition, it urges individuals to bear responsibility by treating all of creation with honor and dignity. Therefore, this subject should be studied in Islamic context so that possible findings can be applied in the Saudi context (Ibn-Humaid, 2012). To evaluate the impact of academic achievement on moral intelligence dimensions, leadership skills, achievement motivation, and self-efficacy among Saudi Middle Schools' Gifted Students.

METHODS

Research Design: This study included Saudi middle schools' gifted students in Makkah, Saudi Arabia. The study determined the difference in moral intelligence, self-efficacy, leadership skills and achievement motivation among Saudi middle school gifted students using a self-administered questionnaire.

Research Population: Information obtained from the Makkahs' Centre for Male Gifted Students showed that there are 733 male gifted students in 89 schools in Makkah, Saudi Arabia (MCMG, 2016). The age of these students ranged between 13 and 15 years. Sample size was determined using the Stoker formula. Based on this formula, a total of 122 male gifted students was required for the study (Stoker 1984). Simple random sampling technique was used to select study sample. This involves making a list of all Saudi middle schools' gifted students in Makkah and assigning sequential number to each student. A random number generator (RESEARCH RANDOMIZER) was used to select the sample.

Research instruments: The study instruments were adopted from previous studies.

Moral intelligence scale: Moral intelligence was evaluated using the scale developed by Al-Naser (2009) which was validated in Arab countries. Al-Naser employed the seven virtues determined by Borba to build these items on the scale. These qualities are empathy, conscience, self-control, respect, kindness, tolerance, and fairness.

Leadership skills scale: Leadership skill was measured using the leadership skill scale developed by Benzahi (2015). This scale measured eight different skills which are communication, planning, time-management, empathy, decision-making, conflict-management, self-confidence, and problem-solving.

Self-efficacy scale: Self-efficacy was assessed using the self-efficacy scale developed by Al-Rababeh (2013). It consists of 27 items which measure the student`s self-efficacy within the class, the extent to which tasks are performed, and the extent of the student`s readiness.

Achievement motivation scale: Achievement motivation is measured using the achievement motivation scale which was developed by Al-Ghamdi (2009). This scale comprised of 80 items that measure ten different dimensions. To ensure validity of the scales, they were delivered to 11 arbitrators who work as educators in different educational colleges in Arab universities and Arabic language teachers. The agreement of 80% was used as a standard upon which the items can be kept as they are or adjusted. The arbitrators were asked to give their suggestions and feedback regarding the items` formation of language; clarity, linguistic appropriateness, the need of amendment, meaning clarity, and the extent to which an item belongs to the dimension and the scale, any other suitable information or amendment. The validated scales were pre-tested among 30 randomly selected students from al-Yamama middle school in Makkah. This school is situated in the study area and has similar attributes with the schools that participated in the main study. These students were eventually excluded from the survey. Although, the Moral intelligence, self-efficacy and Leadership skill scales had been validated and piloted (al-Naser, 2009, Benzahi, 2015 and Al-Ghamdi, 2009, Al-Rababeh, 2013) the pre-test was conducted because of difference in setting and levels. The Cronbach`s alpha for the Moral intelligence, self-efficacy, Leadership skills and achievement motivation scales were 0.861, 0.899, 0.688, and 0.823 respectively.

Data collection: Data was collected using a self administered questionnaire. The questionnaires were distributed to the study participants. A 5-point differential scale ("always," "often," "sometimes," "rarely," and "Never") was used to assess items in the moral intelligence, self-efficacy, leadership skills and achievement motivation domains. This scale was transform into scores with 5 and 1 point assigned to "always" and "never" respectively.

The mean scores were categorized as follows: 1.00 – 2.00 (very low), 2.01 – 3.00 (low), 3.01 – 4.00 (moderate), and 4.01 – 5.00 (high); based on Kabilan (2014).

Data analysis: Data was analysed using SPSS. Categorical data was represented as frequency and percentages while continuous data was described using mean and standard deviation. Normality of the continuous data was tested using graphical methods (histograms, boxplots, Q-Q-plots), numerical methods (skewness and kurtosis indices), and formal normality tests (Shapiro-Wilk test, Kolmogorov-Smirnov). ANOVA was used to determine the difference between the four levels of academic achievement for parametric variables. Also, MANOVA was employed to find out the differences between three or more groups in different types of variables (parametric and non-parametric). Kruskal Wallis test was used to find out the difference among groups for non-parametric variables.

RESULTS

The three levels of middle schools' gifted students: Saudi Middle Schools' Gifted Students are categorized into three levels: first, second and third represented by 46 (37.7%), 42 (34.4%) and 34 (27.9%) students respectively. Academic Achievement of Gifted Students was grouped into four: B-, B+, A- and A+. The highest academic achievement was A+ which represents 60.7%, followed by A- (27.9%), B+ (9%) and B- (2.5%).

Moral intelligence dimensions: Moral intelligence had 7 dimensions and self-control (4.225 ± 0.463), tolerance (3.899 ± 0.515) and conscience (3.625 ± 0.453) had the highest mean score. Respondents demonstrated moderate level of self-control (4.225 ± 0.463), tolerance (3.899 ± 0.515), conscience (3.625 ± 0.453), respect (3.666 ± 0.535) and empathy (3.418 ± 0.484) while fairness (2.665 ± 0.664) and kindness (2.570 ± 0.721) had low mean scores. Table 1 summarizes the mean and standard deviation of the study respondents for the items in the moral intelligence scale.

Table 1: Mean s*cores for Moral Intelligence Dimensions*

Dimensions	Mean	Std. Deviation
Empathy	3.418	0.484
Conscience	3.625	0.453
Self-control	4.225	0.463
Respect	3.666	0.535
Kindness	2.570	0.721
Tolerance	3.899	0.515
Fairness	2.665	0.664

Leadership skills of gifted students: The leadership skills scale had 46 items and item 33 "*I feel comfort when achieving my work on time*" demonstrated the highest mean score (4.66 ± 0.711), followed by item 4 "*I usually enjoy contacting others*" (4.53 ± 0.805) and item 29 ("*I show commitment to studying times*;" 4.31 ± .834) and item 38 ("*I get happy for the success of one of my classmates*;" 4.31 ± 0.873). Item 16 ("*I don`t feel unable to deal with the others*") had the lowest mean score (2.33 ± 1.102). Table 2 demonstrates the mean and standard deviation for the items on the leadership skills domain.

Self-Efficacy Levels for Gifted Students: In the self-efficacy scale, item 22 (*I think I am able to get good marks in tests and scholastic tasks)* had the highest mean score (4.60 ± 0.676), followed by Item 21 "*I pay attention to the teacher when there are difficult topics in a lesson*" (4.54 ± 0.605), and item 14 "*I have the ability to succeed in scholastic tasks that I concentrate on*" (4.47 ± 0.763). The lowest mean scores were observed in item 8 (*I believe levels of tests are beyond my abilities;* 1.97 ± 1.128) and item 6 (*I doubt my scholastic abilities;* 2.06 ± 1.187). Always and often are the most common frequent students' responses about self-efficacy. Table 3 shows the mean scores and standard deviations for the items in the self-efficacy domains.

Achievement motivation levels for gifted students: there were 80 items in the achievement motivation scale. The results indicated that item 1 (*I feel great desire to excel)* had greater mean score (4.79 ± 0.562). This was followed by item 57 ("*I feel satisfied when I do my work fast and well;*" 4.68 ± 0.633) while items 35 ("*I stop doing my work when facing difficulties;*" demonstrated the lowest mean score (1.98 ± 1.036), as shown in Table 4.

Differences in moral intelligence, leadership skills, self-efficacy and achievement motivation based on academic achievement: MANOVA analysis was utilized to determine the significance of the differences in moral intelligence dimensions based on the academic achievement of Saudi middle school gifted students. Students with A+ had the higher mean score for conscience, self-control, respect and tolerance; while B+ had higher score for empathy, kindness and fairness compared to other levels (see table 5). Based on the parameter estimates of the model, significant results were observed for moral intelligence dimensions based on academic achievement level. There was significant impact for the difference between B+ and A+, A+ and B-, B+ and A+, A+ and B- for empathy, self-control, kindness and tolerance with effect size 5.6%, 5.5%, 5.6% and 4.7% respectively, as shown in Table 6. In the leadership skill domain, the mean score for the different academic achievements are as follows: B- (156.33 ± 26.690); B+ (163.27 ± 13.951); A- (171.32 ± 19.957); A+ (174.04 ± 17.983). ANOVA tests revealed that there were no significant differences between the academic achievements (P = 0.140). Self-efficacy mean rank for B-, B+, A- and A+ academic achievement were (23.50); (52.82); (64.76) and (62.83) respectively. This implies that students who had A- academic achievement had higher self-efficacy than others; however, this difference was not significant (0.210). Similarly, there were no significant (P = 0.452) differences in the achievement motivation. Students who had A+ had higher mean rank (64.24), followed by A- (57.26), B- (49.83) and B+ (48.91). The overall score of moral intelligence domain was similar across the four levels of academic achievement. Students who had A+ had the highest mean rank (63.75), followed by A- (61.46), B+ (56.18) and B- (26.00); P = 0.311.

DISCUSSION

This study examines the differences in moral intelligence dimensions, leadership skills, achievement motivation and self-efficacy based on the academic achievement of gifted middle school students in Makkah, Saudi Arabia. The study found that A+ students had higher mean score in conscience, self-control, respect and tolerance; while B+ category had higher mean score for empathy, kindness and fairness compared to other levels of academic achievement. The difference was significant in the kindness domain.

Table 2. Mean scores and standard deviations for items in the *Leadership Skills domain*

No.	Items	Mean	Std. Deviation
1	I listen to all of my classmates` reactions carefully	4.03	.823
2	I write down notes of my teachers	3.26	1.198
3	I find no difficulty expressing myself before my colleagues	3.72	1.221
4	I usually enjoy contacting others	4.53	.805
5	My priority is to find a communicative social environment	3.75	1.168
6	I pre-determine my goals	3.91	1.004
7	I plan for everything I do	3.75	.950
8	I plan well to my education future	4.25	.967
9	I don`t do anything before thinking in it first	3.69	1.076
10	I like activities that have precise plans	3.75	1.257
11	I work hard to improve my plans	4.12	1.025
12	I feel loving me by the others	3.71	1.016
13	I am satisfied about my body look	4.09	1.150
14	I don`t let go for others for no reasons	3.41	1.238
15	I don`t feel hesitated in embarrassing situations	3.16	1.222
16	I don`t feel unable to deal with the others	2.33	1.102
17	I interfere to solve problems between my classmates when they happen	3.62	1.222
18	I use my personal abilities to solve some stuck problems	3.95	.986
19	I can handle encountering daily problems	3.89	.938
20	I don`t find difficulty organizing my thoughts when facing problems	2.93	1.172
21	I collect enough information about the encountered problem	3.80	1.034
22	I think in all different alternatives that may lead to a solution of a problem	3.95	.978
23	I have the ability to choose the right times when making decisions	3.91	.900
24	I usually do the decisions I make	4.05	.801
25	When making any decision, I bear responsibility	4.20	.915
26	I don`t hesitate to make a decision	3.56	1.114
27	I think of the consequences when making decisions	3.87	.962
28	I realize the importance of time when doing any work	4.22	.940
29	I show commitment to studying times	4.31	.834
30	I usually ask my colleagues not to waste time	3.25	1.289
31	I forget about other things during school time	3.49	1.144
32	It is difficult to me to get to the class on time	2.83	1.503
33	I feel comfort when achieving my work on time	4.66	.711
34	I usually start my day with work of high priority	3.95	1.112
35	I share the suffering of my colleagues with them	3.42	1.205
36	I help my colleagues to do their research work	3.43	1.246
37	I get upset hearing bad news about my colleagues	3.82	1.076
38	I get happy for the success of one of my classmates	4.31	.873
39	I enjoy sharing activities with my colleagues	4.03	.995
40	I flatter my colleagues when they deserve	4.05	1.051
41	I seek finding solutions for conflicts that happen between my classmates	3.65	1.149
42	I search for solutions for my classmates` conflicts even if that is on my account	3.34	1.296
43	I try to express my thoughts cooperatively	3.75	1.078
44	I try to decrease the strength of conflicts by neglecting them	3.35	1.272
45	I draw my care to lateral topics instead of facing conflict	3.26	1.218
46	I delay facing conflict for a while until it gets controlled	3.55	1.193
	Overall score of leadership skills	171.88	18.635

Table 3. Respondents mean scores and standard deviations for the items in the self-efficacy domains

No.	Items	Mean	Std. Deviation
1	I find difficulties preparing my lessons	2.33	1.124
2	I can do the study plans I have already made	4.10	.847
3	I find a solution to every encountering scholastic problem	3.97	.833
4	When I am encountered by a scholastic topic, I deal with it properly	4.13	.833
5	I have the ability of being patient and responsible facing difficult scholastic topics	3.88	1.041
6	I doubt my scholastic abilities	2.06	1.187
7	I cannot pay suitable effort for the scholastic tasks	2.16	1.157
8	I believe levels of tests are beyond my abilities	1.97	1.128
9	I can control myself during tests	4.08	1.017
10	I face difficulty understanding some important topics during a lesson	2.62	1.138
11	I can write down the important notes during a lesson	3.71	1.182
12	I can explain some scholastic concepts to my colleagues	3.93	1.010
13	I discuss the opinions of the teacher if I saw them unconvincing	3.73	1.233
14	I have the ability to succeed in scholastic tasks that I concentrate on	4.47	.763
15	I believe I can understand any scholastic topic very well if I wanted that	4.28	.973
16	I keep studying even if the scholastic subject was difficult	4.39	.755
17	I understand delivered topics in the class nevertheless how difficult they are	4.28	.785
18	I can concentrate for a long period of time of a lesson	4.14	.826
19	I can concentrate for a long period of time of a lesson	4.16	.988
20	I participate in difficult discussions	3.90	1.007
21	I pay attention to the teacher when there are difficult topics in a lesson	4.54	.605
22	I think I am able to get good marks in tests and scholastic tasks	4.60	.676
23	I don`t give up easily when I encounter a scholastic problem	4.26	.916
24	When difficulties encounter me when learning a specific scholastic subject, I try again before asking others for help	4.06	.930
25	I trust my abilities in understanding most of scholastic curricula	4.44	.739
26	I think my performance will be good in curricula in spite of their levels of difficulties and their teachers	4.18	.900
27	I ask the teacher to re-explain concepts and topics that I did not understand properly	4.08	1.025
	Overall score of self-efficacy	102.43	9.58

Table 4. *Scores of Achievement Motivation's Outcomes*

No.	Items	Mean	Std. Deviation
1	I feel great desire to excel	4.79	.562
2	I reject giving up easily	4.40	1.010
3	I bear responsibility of my deeds	4.34	.756
4	Rewards encourage me to do my best	3.92	1.147
5	My family gave me enough amount of independency since childhood	3.85	1.081
6	Planning for future does not attract my attention	2.66	1.389
7	I am slow when doing my work	2.34	1.155
8	I tend to do what others do	2.87	1.113
9	I enjoy being with individuals who have the same abilities of mine	4.14	1.086
10	I imagine myself prominent a lot	3.31	1.293
11	If I start a work I should finish it	4.44	.728
12	I feel responsible towards others	3.70	1.067
13	My enthusiasm decreases towards work of no financial value	2.53	1.100
14	I decide doing the work without others` interference	3.46	1.107
15	It is better to do a work that is not difficult	3.29	1.175
16	I care for present leaving future to circumstances	2.89	1.228
17	I care about doing work fast nevertheless how good it is done	2.23	1.218
18	It is better to change my mind if it does not go well with others` opinions	2.98	1.223
19	I seek to excel continuously	4.51	.795
20	I fight to get my aim	4.60	.638
21	I care for my work result not only the work itself	4.10	.885
22	I feel pride for what I do at school and in house	4.23	1.011
23	I feel happy when doing something free of surveillance	3.75	1.210
24	I feel upset when my work is compared to others`	3.07	1.347
25	It is hard to me to overcome obstacles threaten my work	2.71	1.040
26	It is not important to set goals	2.10	1.146
27	Works compile because of my delay	2.70	1.198
28	It is hard to feel failure	3.20	1.264
29	I think of the future which prevent me enjoying the present	2.81	1.152
30	I only feel comfort when I finish all my work	4.39	.877
31	I care a lot to do the work best	4.46	.740
32	I admit failure as I admit success	3.48	1.344
33	I feel less active and enthusiast when doing difficult work	2.66	1.148
34	I hate the work when it is full of competition	2.19	1.235
35	I stop doing my work when facing difficulties	1.98	1.036
36	I hesitate a lot before I make decisions	2.95	1.075
37	Fame is my basic aim of any work I do	2.23	1.119
38	I do what I want to do neglecting others` desires	2.85	1.050
39	Successful persons are the makers of life	4.18	1.021
40	Setting goals facilitates doing things	4.28	.973
41	I use all my time in useful things	3.57	1.020
42	I reject competing others	2.13	1.120
43	I feel desperate and frustrated when I face obstacles	2.61	1.131
44	If I fail in my work then it is because of the others	2.03	1.098
45	Excellence is for few people	2.87	1.240
46	I do my work on time with no delay	3.82	.945
47	I don`t change my mind even if it contradicts majority thoughts	3.64	.988
48	Encouragement from others make me more willing doing my work	4.20	.950
49	I feel languish when doing my work away from competition	3.29	1.072
50	I solve my problems asking no help from others	3.36	.963
51	Retreatment and giving up make me avoid suffering	2.43	1.253
52	Bearing responsibility annoys me	2.62	1.138
53	I do my best to get my work done in spite of the financial reward	3.79	1.077
54	I feel I do work imposed by my parents	3.44	1.460
55	There is no work without difficulties	3.93	1.066
56	Well-planning is the base of success	4.44	.910
57	I feel satisfied when I do my work fast and well	4.68	.633
58	I feel I am able to do unique work	4.51	.795
59	Competition enhance my energy to get my aims	4.17	1.034
60	Success and failure are linked to coincidence	2.02	1.117
61	I have no patience to finish work that takes long time	2.61	1.229
62	The result of my work is not important to me, what matters is to work only	2.21	1.112
63	I do my work the same way with or without encouragement	3.55	1.143
64	I believe in the saying "what is not going to kill me, will only strengthen me"	3.40	1.183
65	Achievement entails setting determined goals	4.07	1.030
66	I like to make what I do well	4.50	.774
67	I prefer doing hard work	3.57	1.003
68	My enthusiasm increases as I compete with others	4.15	1.010
69	I ask for help when facing difficulties	3.33	1.094
70	Excel does not mean much to me	1.99	1.276
71	I spend a lot of my time in funny and entertaining things	2.98	.983
72	Others should bear responsibility with my in regard to my work	2.11	1.035
73	I do my best to get over all difficulties to get to my goals	4.20	.869
74	I set goals for everything I want to achieve in future	4.03	1.012
75	I do my work fast	3.62	.973
76	I trust my skills and abilities	4.42	.822
77	I like competition and do my best to win	4.34	.898
78	Facing difficulties enhance my will to succeed	4.16	.903
79	What others say about my work does not matter	3.43	1.192
80	My family ties me giving a lot of directions and orders regarding my work	3.47	1.228
	Overall score of achievement motivation	272.72	18.339

Table 5. Means of moral intelligence dimensions according to Academic Achievement of gifted students

Independent Variable	Academic achievement	Mean	SD
Empathy	B-	19.33	3.055
	B+	22.55	3.698
	A-	20.82	2.769
	A+	20.11	2.738
Conscience	B-	19.67	3.512
	B+	21.73	4.714
	A-	21.68	2.471
	A+	21.91	2.434
Self-control	B-	21.33	.577
	B+	24.55	3.804
	A-	25.53	2.643
	A+	25.55	2.618
Respect	B-	17.00	1.732
	B+	18.27	3.552
	A-	18.09	2.366
	A+	18.42	2.730
Kindness	B-	12.00	2.000
	B+	12.09	4.369
	A-	10.82	2.844
	A+	9.69	2.510
Tolerance	B-	19.33	.577
	B+	23.00	3.347
	A-	23.24	2.487
	A+	23.69	3.277
Fairness	B-	17.00	4.000
	B+	17.00	5.329
	A-	15.53	3.686
	A+	16.01	3.950

MANOVA test

Table 6: Parameter Estimates of the Interest of Moral Intelligence Dimensions

Sessions	Parameter	B	SE	T	*p* value	95% Confidence Interval		Partial Eta
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Squared
Empathy	Intercept	20.108	.331	60.788	.000	19.453	20.763	.969
	B-	-.775	1.676	-.462	.645	-4.093	2.544	.002
	B+	2.437	.920	2.651	.009	.616	4.258	.056
	A-	.715	.590	1.213	.227	-.452	1.883	.012
	A+	0	.	.	.	.	.	.
Conscience	Intercept	21.905	.318	68.978	.000	21.277	22.534	.976
	B-	-2.239	1.609	-1.391	.167	-5.425	.947	.016
	B+	-.178	.883	-.202	.840	-1.926	1.570	.000
	A-	-.229	.566	-.404	.687	-1.350	.892	.001
	A+	0	.	.	.	.	.	.
Self-control	Intercept	25.554	.317	80.673	.000	24.927	26.181	.982
	B-	-4.221	1.605	-2.630	.010	-7.399	-1.043	.055
	B+	-1.009	.881	-1.145	.254	-2.752	.735	.011
	A-	-.025	.565	-.044	.965	-1.143	1.093	.000
	A+	0	.	.	.	.	.	.
Respect	Intercept	18.419	.314	58.659	.000	17.797	19.041	.967
	B-	-1.419	1.591	-.892	.374	-4.569	1.731	.007
	B+	-.146	.873	-.167	.867	-1.875	1.582	.000
	A-	-.331	.560	-.591	.556	-1.439	.778	.003
	A+	0	.	.	.	.	.	.
Kindness	Intercept	9.689	.326	29.758	.000	9.044	10.334	.882
	B-	2.311	1.650	1.401	.164	-.956	5.577	.016
	B+	2.402	.905	2.654	.009	.609	4.194	.056
	A-	1.134	.580	1.955	.053	-.015	2.283	.031
	A+	0	.	.	.	.	.	.
Tolerance	Intercept	23.689	.355	66.724	.000	22.986	24.392	.974
	B-	-4.356	1.799	-2.422	.017	-7.918	-.794	.047
	B+	-.689	.987	-.698	.486	-2.644	1.265	.004
	A-	-.454	.633	-.717	.475	-1.707	.799	.004
	A+	0	.	.	.	.	.	.
Fairness	Intercept	16.014	.467	34.298	.000	15.089	16.938	.909
	B-	.986	2.365	.417	.677	-3.698	5.671	.001
	B+	.986	1.298	.760	.449	-1.584	3.557	.005
	A-	-.484	.832	-.582	.562	-2.132	1.164	.003
	A+	0	.	.	.	.	.	.

This study also found that there were significant differences between B+ and A+, A+ and B-, B+ and A+, A+ and B- with respect to empathy, self-control, kindness and tolerance. This implies that academic achievement is associated with moral intelligence. These observations are in consonant with Hoseinpoor and Ranjdoost (2013) which explored the relationship between moral intelligence and academic achievement. The result denotes that there is a link between academic achievement and moral intelligence. Mahasna (2014) found that college students had medium level of moral intelligence. First and second year students were observed to have a significant higher moral intelligence. The theoretical implication is that gifted students are likely to be motivated more by the desire to succeed and not the fear of failure. The hierarchal model of achievement motivation Theory involves two approaches, the achievement motive approach and the achievement goal approach (Atkinson et al., 1966). The main achievement motives are desire to succeed and apprehension about failure. These two motives dictate and direct human behaviour towards good and bad actions. Achievement goals are seen as cognitive indicators that direct people to a desirable end. Gifted learners are possibly inspired more by their passion for success than by the fear of failure. They are confident, fast learners, intelligent and have an advanced understanding of concepts, attributes that are not synonymous with people motivated by the fear of failure (Neumeister and Finch, 2006).

This study found that overall score of moral intelligence, leadership skills, achievement motivation and self-efficacy did not vary significantly across the four levels of academic achievement for gifted students. This implies that gifted students shared the similar characteristics in terms of moral intelligence, leadership skills, achievement motivation and self-efficacy irrespective of their academic achievement. The finding of the present study corroborates Malmberg and Little (2007) involving 5th and 6th grade students. Strivers and the disengaged students demonstrated different motivation. The intrinsic and extrinsic motivations for strivers are superior and the intellectual achievement and school well-being. Reeve et al. (2004) posited that self-competent individual when faced with challenges, convert this challenges into motivation. On the other hand, self-incompetent people find difficulties in handling challenges. From the theoretical standpoint, this study's results are in line with trait theory in certain aspects. This theory postulates that people naturally inherit certain traits from their parents that make them leaders. Some of the traits mentioned include self-confidence, courage and extraversion (Hiebert and Klatt, 2001). The trait theory is applicable on the principle of giftedness which comes with characteristics like intelligence, self-confidence, organizational skills and analytical skills. All these are part of leadership skills required for effective management of people. The theory is used in making a comparison between the three levels of Saudi middle schools' gifted students.

Conclusion

Saudi middle schools' gifted students demonstrated varied degree of moral intelligence based on their academic achievement. Students in the A+ group had higher mean score in conscience, self-control, respect and tolerance dimensions, while B+ had the highest score in empathy, kindness and fairness dimensions than other levels of academic achievements. Significant differences were observed in empathy, self-control, respect, and tolerance dimensions. There were no differences in overall score of moral intelligence, leadership skills, achievement motivation and self-efficacy among Saudi middle schools' gifted students based on their academic achievement.

REFERENCES

Ackerman, P., Beier, M. and Boyle, M. 2002. Individual differences in working memory within anomological network of cognitive and perceptual speed abilities. *Journal of Experimental Psychology*, 131, 567-589.

Al-Bawardi, A. 1988. The attitudes and perceptions of faculty members of education and curriculum directors in Saudi Arabia toward the education of gifted Students (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). The University of Wisconsin-Madison, USA.

Al-Ghamdi, G. 2009. *Irrational thinking, Irrational thinking, Self-concept and Achievement Motivation for Talented and Normal of Adolescent students in cities of Makkah and Jeddah* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). College of Education, Umm Al Qura University, Makkah, Saudi Arabia.

Al-Naser, A. 2009. Effectiveness of Teaching-Learning Program in Developing Moral Intelligence of Maltreated Children. Unpublished PhD Thesis, University of Jordan, Amman Jordan. (In Arabic).

Al-Rababeh, K. 2013. Academic Effectiveness and its Relationship with Academic Self-efficacy and the Control Center of Yarmouk University Students. Unpublished MA Thesis, Irbid Jordan

Al-Surur, N. H. 2003. [Introduction to Educational of Talented and Gifted]. Amman: Dar Alvker for printing publishing and distribution. (In Arabic)

Atkinson, J., Brody, N. and Feather, N. 1966. *A Theory of Achievement Motivation.* New York: Wiley Publishers.

Beheshtifar, M. 2011. Role of career competencies in organizations. *European Journal of Economics, Finance and Administrative Sciences, 42*(6), 6-12.

Benzahi, M. 2015. Factorial construction of leadership skills scale of a college student as one of the educational output. Algeria, University Kasdi Merbah Ouargla. (In Arabic)

Bisland, A. 2004. Developing Leadership Skills in Young Gifted Students. *Gifted Child Today*, *27* (1) 24-27.

Borba, M. 2001. Building Moral Intelligence, The Seven Essential Virtues that Teach Kids to Do the Right Thing. *California: Jossey-Bass Publishers*.

Chan, D. W. 2000. Developing the creative leadership training program for gifted and talented students in Hong Kong. *Roeper Review*, 22 (2) 94-97.

Clarken, R. 2009. Moral intelligence in the schools. *School of Education, Northern Michigan University*, PP.1-7

Davis, G. A. and Rimm, S. B. 2004. Education of the gifted and talented. Boston, VA: Pearson Education

Gedney, C.R. 1999. Leadership effectiveness and gender (No.AU/ACSC/061/1999-04). Air Command and Staff College, Air University, Maxwell Air Force Base, Alabama.

Hiebert, M. and Klatt, B. 2001. The encyclopedia of leadership: a practical guide to popular leadership theories and techniques. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Hoseinpoor, Z. and Ranjdoost S. 2013. The Relationship between Moral Intelligence and Academic Progress of Students Third year of High School course in Tabriz City. *Advances in Environmental Biology, 7*(11) 3356 – 3362.

Ibn-Humaid, 2012. Moral values between Islam and western: Accessed on 6-5-2016: www.khutabaa.com/index.cfm?method=home.downloadit and c=13850 and f=292

Jarwan, A. 2011. Giftedness, talent, and creativity. Amman, Jordan: Dar Alfaker.

Kouzes, J. and Posner, B. 2006. The leadership challenge (Vol. 3). John Wiley and Sons.

Lennick, D. and Kiel, F. 2008. Moral Intelligence, Enhancing Business Performance and Leadership Success. New Jersey: Wharton School of the University of Pennsylvania and Pearson Education.

Mahasneh, A. 2014. The level of Moral competence Among Sample of Hashemite University Students. *Canadian Social Science*, *10*(1), 159.

Malmberg, L. E. and Little, T. D. 2007. Profiles of ability, effort, and difficulty: Relationships with worldviews, motivation and adjustment. *Learning and Instruction*, *17*(6), 739-754.

McGregor, L. 2010. Consumer moral leadership. Mount Saint Vincent University. Canada.

MCMG. 2016. Makkahs' center for male gifted students. Retrieved 27 May 2016, from http://mgifted.org.

Najafian, M. 2011. *Exploring the relationship between moral intelligence and job involvement of Kerman university's employees* (Unpublished master thesis). Kerman University, Iran.

Nasr, H. S. 2002. The heart of Islam: enduring values for humanity. First edition, Bethesda, Maryland, USA.

Neumeister, K. L. S. and Finch, H. 2006. Perfectionism in high-ability students: Relational precursors and influences on achievement motivation. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, *50*(3), 238-251.

Pana, L. 2006. Artificial Intelligence and Moral intelligence. Journal of triple C of creative common license, *4*(2), 254-264. Retrieved from: http://www.triple-c.at/index.php/tripleC/article/viewFile/43/42.

Rahimi, G. 2011. The implication of moral intelligence and effectiveness in organization; Are they interrelated?. *International Journal of Marketing and Technology*, *1*(4) 68-73.

Reeve, J., Jang, H., Carrell, D., Jeon, S. and Barch, J. 2004. Enhancing students' engagement by increasing teachers' autonomy support. *Motivation and Emotion*, *28*(2), 147-169.

Stephens, K. R. and Karnes, F. A. 2000. State definitions for the gifted and talented revisited. *Exceptional Children*, *66*(2) 219-238

Stoker, D. 1984. Sampling in practice. *Occasional Paper, 1*(11) 12-35.

****