Exploring the Impact of Moral Intelligence on Psychological Resilience among High School Students: A Case Study

Ahmed K. Hassan[1], Mostafa Samy Amira[2], Albujulaya Naif[3], Mohamed Frikha[4], Ammar Alyousef[5], Abdulmalek K. Bursais[6]

Abstract

The study investigates how moral intelligence helps high school students in Al-Ahsa Saudi Arabia stay psychologically resilient. The project was completed with 425 male and female students by measuring their moral intelligence and psychological resilience across its four important areas using two scales. Results indicated that most participants had average moral intelligence but did better with being attentive and accepting than they did with dealing with criticism and fostering respectful behavior. On average, participants' psychological resilience was moderate and those who had stronger religious values found it simpler to manage stress. Still, many caregivers reported a lack of social support, indicating that further support in this area could be very useful. There were differences between the genders and females did well on tasks related to justice, while males were stronger in social skills. The researchers discovered that strong moral intelligence is related to healthy psychological resilience and that religion and moral traits like empathy and fairness make it easier for people to manage stress. The results suggest that special efforts are needed to improve respect and social networks at school. More studies ought to assess these relationships in many different settings and study whether they continue over the long term, as well as how moral intelligence develops in various educational environments. These investigations will show us how resilience and moral intelligence are influenced by culture and circumstances.

Keywords: Moral Intelligence, School Students, Empathy, Self-Control, Conscience, Tolerance, Justice, Social Support, Personal Competence.

Introduction

Moral intelligence is being noticed more and more as an essential part of education, especially for encouraging the right actions by students and supporting society. That capacity makes someone able to recognize moral values and essential traits such as empathy, conscience, self-control, respect, and justice, all of which are important for building a successful future (Sayed, 2022; Golmohammadian et al., 2015). Studies have pointed out that having moral intelligence is beneficial for academic outcomes and raises a mismatch to believing in academic entitlement (Sayed, 2022; Anito, 2024). Having moral intelligence directly affects how well patients are cared for and how well employees perform (Mohammadi et al., 2020). Additionally, having training programs that build moral intelligence is necessary for making society more civilized in the global era (Mohammadi et al., 2020). Generally, increasing moral intelligence helps

---

[1] Department of Physical Education, College of Education, King Faisal University, Al-Ahsa 31982, Saudi Arabia,Email: amohhamed@kfu.edu.sa (Corresponding Author), https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2918-7572

[2] Department of Physical Education, College of Education, King Faisal University, Al-Ahsa 31982, Saudi Arabia

[3] Department of Physical Education, College of Education, King Faisal University, Al-Ahsa 31982, Saudi Arabia.

[4] Department of Physical Education, College of Education, King Faisal University, Al-Ahsa 31982, Saudi Arabia.

[5] Department of Physical Education, College of Education, King Faisal University, Al-Ahsa 31982, Saudi Arabia.

[6] Department of Physical Education, College of Education, King Faisal University, Al-Ahsa 31982, Saudi Arabia.

individuals manage ethical situations and become involved in making their communities better (Golmohammadian et al., 2015).

Having psychological resilience allows individuals to face challenges by looking after their stress and adjusting healthily (Varghese, 2024). This means encouraging a person's confidence, being positive and getting support from family and the entire community which help them stay strong (Vella & Pai, 2019). Experts have found from studies that resilience lets people change and adapt when they face stress (Luthar et al., 2014). It is now recognized that creative activity can help people cope with hard times (Varghese, 2024). In addition, governments often do this by growing Medicaid and offering subsidies for childcare to help families with money matters and support their development (Varghese, 2024). It is clear from complex systems that many factors influence whether we can resist challenges and these factors must interact for resilience to take effect (Vella & Pai, 2019).

Studies have shown that moral intelligence and psychological resilience work closely together, mostly in difficult situations. Showing strong moral intelligence usually helps people better control their emotions and manage hard situations. Being emotionally grounded and socially capable improves relationships with others which strongly supports a person's resilience (Thaddeus, 2024; Kaur & Chauhan, 2024). Both moral intelligence and psychological resilience have been found to be positively linked to psychological well-being, suggesting that those who have these traits suffer less stress and feel better emotionally (Özsarı & Görücü, 2023). Besides, being resilient helps individuals survive and even succeed despite facing different kinds of problems (Jabeen et al., 2024; Rao et al., 2024). As a result, creating strategies to develop moral thinking and strength can greatly enhance emotional well-being at both work and at home.

Research shows that moral intelligence helps Chinese undergraduate students become more psychologically resilient and use stronger coping strategies. In the study led by Wu and colleagues (2020), the authors show that psychological resilience supports healthier coping methods, highlighting those things such as regulating emotions, being flexible, and being adaptive help, a person adapt better. Being psychologically resilient also helps show that having a high level of emotional intelligence can lessen stress, because it improves resilience, encourages better handling of emotions, and supports healthier choices. Also, doing physical exercise often helps people become more resilient, and this resilience helps strengthen the association between exercise and better coping styles (Zhang et al., 2024). All of this evidence emphasizes how closely related moral intelligence, resilience and coping strategies are for maintaining good mental health.

Integrating moral intelligence helps schools encourage their students to be flexible and develop rapid growth. Bursztyn stresses (2023) that higher moral intelligence helps people build better relationships and become more adaptable, important qualities in learning settings. As shown by Zhou and Hu (2020), when students have positive moral education, they become more responsible members of society. Brooks et al. (2019) present the Oxford Global Leadership Initiative, which offers universities a practical way to support ethical leadership development for all kinds of students. Because more attention is being given to moral education, universities and colleges are adding programs that help students respond to hard social issues. Altan (2017) suggests including moral intelligence in common subjects rather than arranging it in distinct courses, because this prepares students and teachers for fairness and for support of changes that can make society better. As reported by Cujilan et al. (2024), intrapersonal intelligence relates strongly to doing well at school and being flexible, so education systems need to help students

develop moral intelligence in addition to their abilities. Several studies advise using strategies in education that merge ethical, social, and personal growth.

Based on Mukhamedaly et al. (2024), adding moral intelligence and wisdom to school programs is essential for developing students in all areas. According to Gonța et al. (2025), more attention should be given to tolerance activities at school, and new assessments added at various education levels to check if these strategies are effective. Romzi et al. (2024) poia moreut that moral intelligence should be associated with psychological stress and social skills, and encourage schools to focus on instilling moral values during program development. Sofiani et al. (2024) indicate that Islamic schools provide a full framework, explaining that learning moral lessons builds people who manage both their duties and those to society. Fitria & Rosid (2023) state that value-based education is crucial for making students consider ethics and morals, which ultimately improves their performance in different settings. All of these experts support reforms in education that give importance to moral development and relate it to the goals of society, being sustainable.

This research attempted to determine whether a relationship exists between moral intelligence and psychological resilience of high school students in Saudi Arabia. In addition, this research assessed whether differences exist in moral intelligence and psychological resilience based on gender and type of school. This was an important consideration because the researchers wanted to measure whether a correlation existed and to what extent, adding an in-depth breakdown of how these two constructs differ by gender and type of school. Thus, the researcher attempted to answer the following questions: Is there a difference in assessment scores of moral intelligences between male students and female students? Is there a difference in levels of psychological resilience between male students and female students? Does the type of school one attends have any impact on moral intelligence or psychological resilience? The importance of this question is directly related to the shortcomings of the literature about moral intelligence and psychological resilience for high school students in Saudi Arabia. The findings will generalize well to future peer-reviewed articles seeking comparatives. In addition, this research will show that two facets of the Saudi educational experience have not been extensively researched but could use new programming to foster better moral development and improved efforts of psychological resilience for this demographic.

Materials and Methods

Participants

The studies pattern consisted of 425 male and lady secondary college students from the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia, together with 217 girl college students and 208 male college students, elderly between 15 and 18 years. Participants were selected using non-probability sampling techniques. Table 1 offers a detailed breakdown of the demographic distribution of the members throughout the independent variables studied. Before their involvement, excessive faculty students acquired written consent from their parents or guardians, ensuring their consent to participate in the look at. Ethical approval of the research was granted by the Ethics Committee of King Faisal University under Regulation, which adheres to the standards mentioned in the Declaration of Helsinki (2013). During which scales were systematically disbursed to minimize disruption to participants' day-by-day workouts and ensure compliance with the study protocols. The studies technique prioritized transparency, confidentiality, and participant autonomy, aligning with the moral requirements governing human research. These measures ensured the integrity of the records collection procedure while safeguarding the rights and well-being of all individuals.

Variables	Category	Number	Percentage
Gender	Male	208	49.00%
	Female	217	51.00%
School Type	Private Schools	193	45.41%
	National Schools	232	54.59%

Table 1. Distribution of Sample Individuals According to Independent Variables

Instrument

The data employed two major instruments that were the Moral Intelligence Scale (Sayed, 2022; Altan, 2017) and the Psychological Resilience Scale (Wu et al., 2020; Afek et al., 2021), which the researchers developed and modified. The Moral Intelligence Scale was first comprised of 68 items; the review done by experts resulted in the removal of eight items, leading to a scale of 60 items grouped into six constructs (empathy, respect, self-control, conscience, tolerance, and justice--10 items for each factor: see Appendix A). Internal consistency was assessed by Pearson's correlation coefficient, with the axis correlations varying from 0.592 to 0.773, while 0.611 to 0.743 for the second axis, 0.634 to 0.794 for the third, 0.583 to 0.793 for the fourth, 0.554 to 0.813 for the fifth, and 0.532 to 0.655 for the sixth. The correlation coefficients between each axis and the total score for the scale ranged between 0.731 and 0.833. The same expert reviews had the Psychological Resilience Scale consist of 40 items, later increased to 45, with 4 dimensions, namely: social support (9 items), personal competence (16 items), social and family competence (11 items), and value and religious structure (9 items) (see Appendix B). The same internal consistency was measured by Pearson's correlation, whereby the value of the axes ranged from 0.544 to 0.784 for the first axis, from 0.611 for the second, from 0.554 to 0.787 for the third, and from 0.653 to 0.842 for the fourth. Whereas the correlation coefficients between each axis and the total score ranged from 0.774 to 0.862. Both scales were rated on a five-point Likert-type scale (1 = Strongly Does Not Apply, 5 = Strongly Applies). While administering these scales, a correlation coefficient of 0.843 was obtained for moral intelligence, and a value of 0.783 was obtained for psychological resilience. Statistical significance of these variables was proved at $P < 0.01$, thus confirming strong internal consistency. Evidence from Cronbach's Alpha coefficients further supported the validity and reliability of both scales, with the moral intelligence scale being stable from 0.754 to 0.846 and the psychological resilience scale being stable between 0.774 to 0.855. These findings illustrate the strength and reliability of the tools used in this study.

Questionnaire:

The researchers created the scales for the usage of Google Drive gear. The researchers furnished a formal introduction, after which they obtained approval to distribute the scales to students. Students have been capable of getting admission to these scales at the beginning of the first semester of the 2024-2025 educational 12 months. Google Drive furnished an automatic technique for collecting responses immediately, creating digital tables that the researchers ought

to use for evaluation. The distribution period for the scales and series of scholar surveys spanned September 3 to October 17, 2024. During the pre-studies briefing, contributors have been fully knowledgeable of the scope of the look at and the associated risks within ethical frameworks. They have been confident that the study's data will be used for educational purposes handiest and that their private data could be kept strictly confidential. Each participant gave their knowledgeable consent through voluntary consent paperwork from their dad and mom to the research pointers all through the have a look at. The studies protocol maintains moral standards and protects the safety of contributors by minimizing potential risks from the preliminary evaluation section of the have a look through its finishing touch.

Statistical Analysis

The evaluation of the survey facts was carried out the use of IBM Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) model 26, a broadly recognized and reliable device in academic research. This software facilitated a comprehensive exam of the dataset via a detailed descriptive evaluation, which encompassed the computation of means, standard deviations, variances, chi-square checks, and the translation of Cronbach's alpha scores to ensure internal consistency and reliability of the scales. The use of SPSS 26 better the credibility and robustness of the findings, as it's a reliable program acknowledged for its precision in statistical reviews. To ensure the validity of the consequences, a significance threshold of $p < 0.05$ changed into hooked up as the benchmark for figuring out statistical importance. This threshold showed the reliability of the findings and underscored the methodological rigor of the have a look at. Additionally, the response scores for the survey gadgets were measured the usage of a five-factor Likert scale, with the subsequent anchors: "Never" corresponding to a score of one, "Sometimes" to a score of two, "Somewhat" to a score of three, "Rarely" to a rating of four, and "Always" to a rating of five. This established scoring machine allowed for constant and standardized statistical series, enabling correct comparisons and interpretations of participant responses.

Ethical Considerations

The Al-Ahsa Education Department permitted the observer, citing moral requirements. School principals then permitted the researchers to conduct the look. Before the look at commenced, all participants had been furnished with information detailing the results of their participation and asked to adhere to moral standards. Furthermore, the university Ethics Committee permitted them take a look at, assigning it the reference number KFU-REC-2024-July-ETHICS2132, demonstrating compliance with the examination's ethical standards.

Results

Phrase	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Chi-Square	Sig.	KMO
Empathy						
1		2.36	1.38	95.23	0.000	
2		2.78	1.15	70.45	0.000	
3	**425**	3.11	0.84	401.27	0.000	**0.738**
4		2.89	0.92	172.34	0.000	
5		3.04	1.14	176.29	0.000	
6		3.31	0.87	212.47	0.000	
7		3.17	1.05	157.31	0.000	

Phrase	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Chi-Square	Sig.	KMO
8		3.28	0.99	252.18	0.000	
9		3.23	0.81	295.04	0.000	
10		2.45	0.89	205.12	0.000	
Total		2.97	0.54	220.37	0.000	
Respect						
11		2.26	1.27	131.34	0.000	
12		2.42	1.02	275.41	0.000	
13		2.18	0.97	181.23	0.000	
14		2.71	1.11	143.27	0.000	
15	**425**	2.18	1.13	213.45	0.000	**0.864**
16		2.56	1.04	167.19	0.000	
17		2.78	1.15	117.43	0.000	
18		3.06	0.87	222.38	0.000	
19		2.69	0.68	465.32	0.000	
20		2.26	0.92	235.46	0.000	
Total		2.52	0.72	243.67	0.000	
Self-control						
21		2.37	1.19	99.21	0.000	
22		2.47	1.24	55.67	0.000	
23		2.87	0.98	159.34	0.000	
24		3.09	0.78	318.23	0.000	
25	**425**	3.26	0.85	154.29	0.000	**0.754**
26		3.26	0.81	132.27	0.000	
27		3.12	1.03	159.41	0.000	
28		3.30	0.94	189.32	0.000	
29		3.22	0.91	197.28	0.000	
30		3.23	0.97	53.45	0.000	
Total		3.03	0.52	197.23	0.000	
Conscience						
31		3.19	1.03	192.34	0.000	
32		3.56	1.03	157.28	0.000	
33		3.55	0.95	199.27	0.000	
34		3.48	1.04	204.19	0.000	
35	**425**	3.51	0.93	298.45	0.000	**0.621**
36		3.47	0.84	293.28	0.000	
37		3.47	1.03	113.45	0.000	
38		3.63	1.04	123.27	0.000	
39		3.84	0.77	176.34	0.000	
40		4.04	0.87	116.39	0.000	
Total		3.58	0.41	351.27	0.000	

Table 2. Means and Standard Deviations from the Moral Intelligence Scale Assessment

Continue.

Phrase	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Chi-Square	Sig.	KMO

Tolerance						
41		3.79	0.79	172.45	0.000	
42		3.93	0.88	90.34	0.000	
43		3.92	0.75	220.34	0.000	
44		3.95	0.83	103.27	0.000	
45	**425**	3.51	0.89	425.34	0.000	**0.599**
46		3.53	0.73	176.45	0.000	
47		2.70	1.06	370.28	0.000	
48		2.82	1.06	251.34	0.000	
49		3.76	0.80	139.27	0.000	
50		3.91	0.89	132.45	0.000	
Total		3.58	0.32	276.34	0.000	
justice						
51		3.72	0.76	392.45	0.000	
52		3.82	0.83	97.34	0.000	
53		3.47	1.00	263.27	0.000	
54		3.66	0.81	362.34	0.000	
55	**425**	3.47	0.88	123.45	0.000	**0.617**
56		3.53	0.95	167.28	0.000	
57		3.58	0.87	121.34	0.000	
58		3.37	0.94	152.34	0.000	
59		3.50	0.86	222.34	0.000	
60		3.41	0.71	310.27	0.000	
Total		3.55	0.37	410.27	0.000	
Total	**425**	3.22	0.21	185.34	0.000	**0.713**

Table 2 shows that the six dimensions of moral intelligence- empathy, respect, self-control, conscience, tolerance, and justice had moderate values, and the overall mean was 3.22 (SD = 0.21). Participants demonstrated that they could understand both people's feelings and facial expressions, but had difficulties dedicating themselves to helping someone in pain. Students seemed to respect each other in honest ways, yet they struggled at times with not using something that belonged to others. Difficulties with impulsive choices and feeling emotions strongly were reported, but it was obvious that being patient when waiting for a reward was easier. While the conscience domain showed healthy moral reasoning, a group of participants admitted it was tough for them to evaluate their behavior or see things from another's viewpoint. While being tolerant, people had a hard time with newer ideas and were sometimes too quick to judge situations. Fairness was respected in justice matters, except that there were incidents of influenced decisions and rule manipulation. The significant chi-square results ($p < 0.000$) and KMO scoring (0.599–0.864) have high reliability and show where results are strong and where growth can occur.

Phrase	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Chi-Square	Sig.	KMO
social support						
1	425	2.37	1.40	93.45	0.000	0.784
2		2.74	1.13	72.67	0.000	

		Mean	Std. Deviation	Chi-Square	Sig.	KMO
3		3.11	0.93	316.28	0.000	
4		2.88	0.96	148.34	0.000	
5		3.14	1.19	90.23	0.000	
6		3.32	0.86	216.45	0.000	
7		3.25	1.06	210.34	0.000	
8		3.29	1.00	242.18	0.000	
9		3.28	0.84	267.34	0.000	
Total		2.97	0.54	242.67	0.000	
personal competence						
10		2.45	1.34	73.67	0.000	
11		2.64	1.10	232.18	0.000	
12		2.36	1.05	229.34	0.000	
13		2.89	1.10	149.67	0.000	
14		2.37	1.21	126.34	0.000	
15	425	2.74	1.05	134.67	0.000	0.840
16		2.96	1.14	137.23	0.000	
17		3.10	0.91	192.45	0.000	
18		2.84	0.78	400.67	0.000	
19		3.72	0.78	149.67	0.000	
20		3.94	0.88	91.34	0.000	
21		3.93	0.75	222.45	0.000	
22		3.96	0.83	105.23	0.000	
23		3.52	0.89	430.34	0.000	
24		3.54	0.73	178.45	0.000	
25		2.27	0.92	238.45	0.000	
total		3.08	0.48	208.45	0.000	
social and family competence						
26		2.38	1.19	100.34	0.000	
27		2.48	1.25	56.34	0.000	
28	425	2.88	0.98	160.34	0.000	0.703
29		3.10	0.78	318.45	0.000	
30		3.28	0.85	154.34	0.000	
31		3.27	0.81	134.67	0.000	
32		3.31	0.94	192.34	0.000	
33		3.23	0.91	200.45	0.000	

Table 3. Means and Standard Deviations from the Psychological Resilience Scale Assessment

Continue.

Phrase	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Chi-Square	Sig.	KMO
34		3.24	0.97	54.34	0.000	
total		3.02	0.51	185.34	0.000	
value and religious	425					0.715

structure						
35		3.21	0.98	224.34	0.000	
36		3.58	0.98	206.45	0.000	
37		3.52	1.00	173.45	0.000	
38		3.59	1.00	243.45	0.000	
39		3.60	0.89	360.45	0.000	
40		3.53	0.83	296.34	0.000	
41		3.50	1.01	153.45	0.000	
42		3.64	1.05	121.34	0.000	
43		3.84	0.78	168.45	0.000	
44		3.23	0.91	200.45	0.000	
45		4.05	0.87	118.45	0.000	
total		3.57	0.34	334.45	0.000	
TOTAL	425	3.19	0.27	165.45	0.000	0.733

The information in Table 3 shows participants had relatively strong psychological resilience across four aspects—social support, personal competence, social and family competence, and value and religious structure, with an average score of 3.19 (SD = 0.27). Participants in the social support group felt their family and therapists gave them enough support, but expressed doubts about whether their friends would support them financially or institutionally. People in this group often solved problems well and remained positive, yet they struggled a bit with regulating their emotions and managing their time. They successfully connected with loved ones and tended to work well with others, but they had trouble continuing friendships and understanding people. This domain highlighted a strong practice of faith and dependence on God; even so, some challenges were found in upholding social traditions and being thankful. The chi-square values being very low (p < 0.000) and the strong KMO values (0.703–0.840) help support the findings which stress both resilience and areas that could improve, with a special focus on social connections, controlling emotions and flexible interpersonal skills, allowing useful ideas for targeted assistance to support psychological resilience in various situations.

	Empathy	Respect	Self-control	Conscience	Tolerance	justice	total	social support	personal competence	Social and family competence	value and religious structure	total
Empathy	1											
Respect	0.032	1										
Self-control	0.121*	0.284**	1									

Conscience	-0.058	-0.149**	-0.005	1								
Tolerance	0.092	0.018	-0.032	-0.042	1							
justice	0.045	-0.043	-0.082	-0.054	0.187**	1						
total	0.492**	0.638**	0.575**	0.178**	0.312**	0.275**	1					
social support	0.995**	0.028	0.118*	-0.059	0.090	0.042	0.493**	1				
personal competence	-0.018	0.798**	0.296**	-0.136**	0.218**	-0.018	0.576**	-0.016	1			
Social and family competence	0.085	0.299**	0.988**	0.015	-0.024	-0.105*	0.568**	0.086	0.316**	1		
value and religious structure	-0.064	-0.104*	0.073	0.835**	0.023	-0.044	0.198**	-0.065	-0.075	0.094	1	
total	0.423**	0.618**	0.651**	0.143**	0.174**	-0.028	0.865**	0.424**	0.740**	0.662**	0.266*	1

Table 4. Correlation Coefficients Between the Moral Intelligence Scale and the Psychological Resilience Scale

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level**.**

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level.

The relationships between moral intelligence and psychological resilience are displayed in the correlation analysis in Table 4. An important overlap between moral intelligence and psychological resilience was noticed, since their total scores correlated strongly ($r = 0.865$, $p <$

0.01). Training showed a very strong connection with social support (r = 0.995, p < 0.01), meaning that people with more empathy usually believe they receive more social support. On the same note, having respect for others was linked to being self-confident (r = 0.798, p < 0.01), suggesting that respect boosts a person's confidence and ability to solve problems. The link between self-control and social and family competence was especially strong (r = 0.988, p < 0.01), indicating that having discipline greatly helps people get along well with others. Alternatively, lower or negative correlations appeared between conscience and personal competence (r = -0.136, p < 0.01) and between justice and social and family competence (r = -0.105, p < 0.05).

Gender		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
							Lower	Upper
Moral Intelligence								
Empathy	Male	208	3.04	0.56	0.31	0.754	-0.089	0.131
	Female	217	3.02	0.54				
Respect	Male	208	2.46	0.80	-1.51	0.132	-0.252	0.041
	Female	217	2.58	0.65				
Self-control	Male	208	3.14	0.48	2.01	0.045*	0.003	0.207
	Female	217	3.03	0.52				
Conscience	Male	208	3.67	0.38	1.60	0.111	-0.015	0.149
	Female	217	3.60	0.41				
Tolerance	Male	208	3.61	0.31	-1.62	0.106	-0.120	0.015
	Female	217	3.66	0.30				
justice	Male	208	3.55	0.36	-2.89	0.004**	-0.185	-0.035
	Female	217	3.65	0.35				
total	Male	208	3.25	0.21	-0.82	0.412	-0.060	0.025
	Female	217	3.26	0.20				

Psychological Resilience								
social support	Male	208	3.03	0.56	0.32	0.750	-0.092	0.133
	Female	217	3.01	0.52				
personal competence	Male	208	3.10	0.51	-0.58	0.562	-0.122	0.066
	Female	217	3.13	0.44				
Social and family competence	Male	208	3.13	0.47	2.12	0.035*	0.007	0.216
	Female	217	3.02	0.51				
value and religious structure	Male	208	3.66	0.34	1.65	0.099	-0.010	0.130
	Female	217	3.59	0.32				
total	Male	208	3.24	0.27	1.12	0.264	-0.024	0.089
	Female	217	3.21	0.26				

Table 5. Independent Samples T-Test to Determine the Effect of Gender on the Moral Intelligence and Psychological Resilience Scales

As shown in Table 5, results from the independent samples t-test highlight any gender differences among participants in moral intelligence and psychological resilience. We did not see major differences in the overall scores but found them in particular aspects. Men demonstrated better self-control and stronger bonds with their families and social circles when it came to moral intelligence, according to the results (self-control, t = 2.01, p = 0.045; social and family competence, t = 2.12, p = 0.035). Contrary to that, female respondents demonstrated a greater sense of fairness and equality in justice (t = -2.89, p = 0.004) than males. The total score for moral intelligence did not vary significantly between men and women (t = 0.82, p = 0.412). No important difference was found in the overall score on psychological resilience (t = 1.12, p = 0.264). Yet, males appeared to have slightly better scores than females on the social and family competence scale. Generally, these results indicate that males tend to be better at controlling their actions and interacting with others, whereas females are usually stronger in matters of justice. They confirm that taking gender differences into account helps improve moral and psychological development in women.

college	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	sig.	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
						Lower	Upper

Moral Intelligence								
Empathy	Private Schools	193	3.05	0.54	0.92	0.358	-0.058	0.162
	National Schools	232	2.99	0.56				
Respect	Private Schools	193	2.48	0.76	-1.42	0.157	-0.251	0.049
	National Schools	232	2.60	0.68				
Self-control	Private Schools	193	3.08	0.49	0.41	0.680	-0.078	0.133
	National Schools	232	3.06	0.52				
Conscience	Private Schools	193	3.64	0.40	0.55	0.584	-0.056	0.112
	National Schools	232	3.61	0.40				
Tolerance	Private Schools	193	3.63	0.32	0.11	0.914	-0.059	0.064
	National Schools	232	3.62	0.30				
Justice	Private Schools	193	3.60	0.38	0.10	0.923	-0.069	0.073
	National Schools	232	3.59	0.35				
total	Private Schools	193	3.25	0.20	-0.14	0.886	-0.045	0.040
	National Schools	232	3.24	0.21				
Psychological Resilience								
social support	Private Schools	193	3.04	0.53	0.88	0.379	-0.056	0.160
	National Schools	232	2.99	0.55				
personal competence	Private Schools	193	3.08	0.47	-1.85	0.065*	-0.180	0.008
	National Schools	232	3.16	0.46				
social and family competence	Private Schools	193	3.07	0.49	0.42	0.673	-0.075	0.128
	National Schools	232	3.05	0.51				
value and religious structure	Private Schools	193	3.65	0.33	1.48	0.139	-0.015	0.123
	National	232	3.58	0.32				

	Schools							
total	Private Schools	193	3.22	0.27	-0.10	0.918	-0.056	0.052
	National Schools	232	3.21	0.26				

Table 6. Independent Samples T-Test to Determine the Effect of School Type on the Moral Intelligence and Psychological Resilience Scales

*Significant at the 0.05 level.

Table 6 proves that school type (private or national) makes a difference in moral intelligence and psychological resilience. Overall, there were no significant differences between school types regarding total moral intelligence (M = 76.58, SD = 5.91) or psychological resilience (M = 73.91, SD = 9.41). Despite this, we found only a minor difference among students in personal competence, with students in national schools scoring slightly higher than their peers in private schools (t = -1.85, p = 0.065), hinting at variation in their self-confidence and solutions to problems. With empathy, value, and religious structure, differences were few and not important, confirming that schools did not vary much in emotional sensitivity or faith-related toughness. Likewise, differences in respect, self-control, and social support were not significant, showing that the groups have similar strengths.

Age		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Moral Intelligence						
Empathy	Between Groups	0.18	3	0.06	0.19	0.904
	Within Groups	124.76	421	0.30		
	Total	124.94	424			
Respect	Between Groups	0.82	3	0.27	0.48	0.695
	Within Groups	220.45	421	0.52		
	Total	221.27	424			
Self-control	Between Groups	0.40	3	0.13	0.48	0.696
	Within Groups	113.28	421	0.27		
	Total	113.68	424			
Conscience	Between Groups	0.63	3	0.21	1.18	0.318
	Within Groups	71.52	421	0.17		
	Total	72.15	424			
Tolerance	Between Groups	1.05	3	0.35	3.32	0.020*
	Within Groups	43.28	421	0.10		
	Total	44.33	424			
Justice	Between Groups	0.38	3	0.13	0.86	0.462
	Within Groups	57.82	421	0.14		
	Total	58.20	424			
total	Between Groups	0.00	3	0.00	0.02	0.998
	Within Groups	20.45	421	0.05		
	Total	20.45	424			
Psychological Resilience						

social support	Between Groups	0.16	3	0.05	0.18	0.908
	Within Groups	124.98	421	0.30		
	Total	125.14	424			
personal competence	Between Groups	0.58	3	0.19	0.78	0.504
	Within Groups	97.25	421	0.23		
	Total	97.83	424			
social and family competence	Between Groups	0.72	3	0.24	0.88	0.450
	Within Groups	108.47	421	0.26		
	Total	109.19	424			
value and religious structure	Between Groups	0.32	3	0.11	0.88	0.451
	Within Groups	48.67	421	0.12		
	Total	48.99	424			
total	Between Groups	0.01	3	0.00	0.06	0.980
	Within Groups	31.85	421	0.08		
	Total	31.86	424			

Table 7. One-Way ANOVA Analysis of Variance of Participants' Scores on Moral Intelligence and Psychological Resilience by Age

*Significant at the 0.05 level.

The results shown in Table 7 clarify whether age plays a role in participants' scores on dimensions of moral intelligence and psychological resilience. It is shown that age solely affected tolerance within moral intelligence ($F = 3.32$, $p = 0.020$), implying that the ability to agree with those differing from them and to adapt to others' views differ across the groups. As for empathy ($F = 0.19$, $p = 0.904$), respect ($F = 0.48$, $p = 0.695$), and self-control ($F = 0.48$, $p = 0.696$), no differences were found related to age, which suggests that these are independent of age. Social support ($F = 0.18$, $p = 0.908$), personal competence ($F = 0.78$, $p = 0.504$), and value and religious structure ($F = 0.88$, $p = 0.451$) did not significantly change between different age groups in psychological resilience. Age did not seem to make a significant difference in moral intelligence ($F = 0.02$, $p = 0.998$) or psychological resilience ($F = 0.06$, $p = 0.980$).

Discussion

The study observed that students reached an average score for moral intelligence testing in every aspect of the moral intelligence measure. Students at this level have a strong understanding of ethical issues and act properly thanks to their ethical principles. These studies demonstrate how successful educators focus on moral intelligence to improve students' moral actions and their academic results. Evidence suggests that scholars at the advanced level of education can appreciate issues of morality, which is shown by having individuals with moral traits such as honesty and responsibility (Khazaei et al., 2024). Educational organizations push this form of intelligence by integrating sports in their curriculum and extra-curricular programs, which instill important moral values and help students connect with their culture (Khazaei et al., 2024). Including moral intelligence in education improves college students' performance and tends to make women demonstrate higher ethical skills (Anito, 2024). Improving college students' moral character is important for their future roles as both leaders and valuable members of society (Khazaei et al., 2024).

When religious and cultural activities are added to the curriculum, schools play an important role in boosting children's moral intelligence and teaching them right from wrong, as well as

strong spiritual beliefs. Nursalim et al. (2024) developed a comprehensive model for adding spiritual elements to each part of schooling, promoting students'principles of moral conduct. Im (2011) points out that ethical guidelines should be woven into different topics and everyday faculty work, while effort is made to include schools and parents in building moral habits. In the same way, Samol (2024) recommends united efforts amongst universities, society and government, assisted by technology, to help teach non secular knowledge and address issues caused by modernization and society splitting into groups. Cahyanto et al. (2024) also outline how faculty habits such as communal prayers help build students' spiritual identity, but it remains difficult to be consistent. David Suharyat and his team (2023) have proven that college students need religious engagement and social finesse to develop their spiritual identity, so they learn right from wrong. Despite all these attempts, some regions are still lacking when it comes to accepting respectful feedback and showing it's helpful, revealing a chasm between moral guidelines and daily practice. So, colleges should make sure that non secular values and moral behavior are taught alongside capabilities like emotional control and conflict handling, in programs that deal with real-world scenarios.

Research helps the belief that schools serve as important establishments for developing moral intelligence by means of fostering tolerance and empathy via spiritual and cultural sports (Budiman et al., 2024; Suharyat et al., 2023). The present take a look at identifies huge boundaries: weak popularity of complaint and terrible anger law abilties, which preclude the practical utility of ethical standards. These findings align with Budiman et al.'s (2024) end concerning the restricted translation of theoretical values into practice. Furthermore, Romzi et al. (2024) emphasize that integrating Islamic teachings into educational frameworks enhances ethical commitment, underscoring the need for holistic spiritual education and skill development packages. Emotional control and struggle decision making are critical additives, as highlighted through Lakshmi (2024), for addressing modern ethical challenges. Combining non secular value enrichment with sensible ability improvement enables college students to emerge as "ethical retailers" capable of safeguarding societal ethical identification (Romzi et al., 2024; Suharyat et al., 2023).

The participants in this study demonstrated common scores across the mental resilience dimensions, consisting of personal competence, social and own family competence, social help, and values and non-secular shape. The findings suggest that psychological resilience shares overlapping attributes with moral intelligence, as evidenced by emotional leadership talents (personal competence) and value-driven approaches (non-secular structure), enhancing ethical decision-making. Most dimensions of resilience showed no huge differences based on demographic factors, together with academic majors or gender, suggesting that the improvement of resilience is inspired more by social and cultural factors than by using inherent personal trends. This underscores the significance of addressing weak social assistance networks, which could prevent resilience improvement, and highlights the need for universities to put in place interventions to reinforce pupil support structures, mainly given the robust connection between social support and dealing with moral challenges. These results align with up scholarly work, which posits that mental resilience incorporates a couple of factors, along with non-public talents and social community connections (Brukhovetska, 2024; Gașper, 2024). Personal competence and cost-based dedication were observed to significantly align with mental resilience, as each enables effective management of ethical dilemmas (Rushton, 2024). Furthermore, Pan et al. (2024) revealed that male or woman traits can be less influential as compared to shared cultural or upbringing impacts, as demographic information uncovered no predominant variations in

resilience tiers. The lack of social aid emerged as a big obstacle to resilience improvement, emphasizing the need for faculty-degree interventions to bolster guide structures. Both non-public and social assets should be cultivated to foster environments conducive to building resilience, as those findings suggest.

Conclusions

The study demonstrates that having moral intelligence helps students in Saudi Arabia's secondary schools develop their psychological resilience. A high degree of moral intelligence led students to show stronger psychological resilience, since their good moral qualities helped them handle crises and cope well. While participants were conscientious and showed tolerance, being respectful toward feedback was a challenge for many which may point to difficulties in communication that stem from education and culture. A strong score on the religious and value sides of the SC indicates that Islamic principles are working in the character development of a person. Yet, the varying levels of social and interpersonal competence indicate that students may not be well supported by their surroundings, so they may need greater links to institutions and the community to strengthen peer relationships and improve stress management skills for what's to come. Results from the research stress the importance of customized support to deal with respect and social support issues, as well as using the benefits of religious values and moral knowledge for building resilience.

Limitations

The study gives important information on how moral intelligence affects psychological resilience in Saudi Arabian secondary students. On the other hand, it's important to mention what Econ isn't good at. To begin, the data for the study mainly came from what participants said and that may cause the results to be swayed because of their subjectivity or desire to behave in a certain way. In addition, all participants came from secondary schools in Saudi Arabia and no other educational or cultural settings, so the results cannot be applied everywhere. Third, how the study was conducted does not allow us to prove that moral intelligence causes better psychological resilience. We need continuous research over time to find out how these abilities change as people age. Even so, while investigating resilience and moral intelligence, the study did not consider external factors like family life, economic background or hobbies and activities.

Future Research Directions

Future investigations should overcome the problems pointed out by collecting data from self-reports and observing or interviewing people. Adding students from assorted educational levels, regions and cultural backgrounds to the sample would make the findings more useful for others. More information about the causes behind both moral intelligence and psychological resilience can be revealed by tracking subjects over a long period. Future researchers should also investigate how outside influences, for example family, finances and community life, affect resilience. Studying if programs designed to improve respect, social support and interpersonal skills work well could supply effective methods for both educators and policymakers. Looking at the relationship of moral intelligence with emotional intelligence or grit may give us deeper insights into why and how resilience occurs.

KFU251922).

References

Altan, M. (2017). Moral intelligence for more diverse and democratic world. European Journal of Education Studies, 3 (3), 197–209. https://doi.org/10.46827/EJES.V0I0.519

Anito, H. D. (2024). Moral Intelligence and Academic Performance of Secondary School Students. Technium Social Sciences Journal, 63, 15–27. https://doi.org/10.47577/tssj.v63i1.11886

Brooks, E., Brant, J., & Lamb, M. (2019). How can universities cultivate leaders of character? Insights from a leadership and character development program at the University of Oxford. The International Journal of Ethics, 4 (2), 167–182. https://doi.org/10.1007/S40889-019-00075-X

Brukhovetska, O. (2024). Psychological features of the development of adolescent resilience. Vìsnik Pìslâdiplomnoï Osvìti: Zbìrnik Naukovih Prac′., 30(59), 47–64. https://doi.org/10.58442/3041-1858-2024-30(59)-47-64

Budiman, S. A., Sain, Z. H., & Kurniawan, W. (2024). The Role of Religious Extracurricular Program Activities in Fostering Religious Moderation among Students of Public Universities. Tarbawi, 10*(02), 231–242. https://doi.org/10.32678/tarbawi.v10i02.9922

Bursztyn, M. (2023). The importance of emotional intelligence in the education and activity of young people (pp. 97–119). https://doi.org/10.15633/8788363241940.04

Cahyanto, B., Indana, F. M., Fiveronica, I., Salamah, E. R., & Garbacz, N. A. (2024). Integration of Religious Character in School Culture: An Investigation of Character Development Practices in Islamic Elementary School. Elementary: Islamic Teacher Journal, 12(1), 49. https://doi.org/10.21043/elementary.v12i1.23309

Cujilan, L. M., Acosta, G. G., & Yumisaca Guacho, C. P. (2024). Significant impact of intrapersonal intelligence on the learning of elementary school students. LATAM Latin American Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities, 5 (5), 4226–4240. https://doi.org/10.56712/latam.v5i5.2920

Dong, G., Lin, X., Wei, S., Dong, W., & Zhang, S. (2024). The Impact of College Students' Emotional Intelligence on Stress Perception: The Mediating Roles of Psychological Resilience and Positive Coping Style, 2(3), 11-20. https://doi.org/10.59825/jet.2024.2.3.11

Fitria, R., & Rosid, A. (2023). dentification of Best Practices of Higher Education Leadership in Shaping Student Character following Islamic Guidance. Jurnal Iqra': Kajian Ilmu Pendidikan, 8(1), 434–448. https://doi.org/10.25217/ji.v8i1.3928

Gaşper, L. (2024). Resilience as a socio-psychological resource for strengthening human and social capital, Conference: Strengthening social resilience by capitalizing on human capital in the context of the accession of the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine to the European Union, 166–173. https://doi.org/10.59295/crs2024.13

Golmohammadian, M., Behrozi, N., & Yaseminejad, P. (2015). Moral intelligence, its nature and essentiality. Medical Ethics Journal, 9(33), 121–142. https://journals.sbmu.ac.ir/en-me/article/view/12691

Gonța, I., VULPE, E.-D.-A., & IONIȚĂ, H.-S. (2025). Fostering values through education: psychological resources and strategies for a nonaggressive university environment. Revista de Pedagogie, LXXII(2), 65–93. https://doi.org/10.26755/revped/2024.2/65

Jabeen, S., Khan, Z. H., & Mursaleen, M. (2024). Exploring the Relationship between Emotional Intelligence and Resilience: A Clinical Psychological Perspective. Bulletin of Business and Economics (BBE), 13(1), 372-377. https://doi.org/10.61506/01.00215

Kaur, J., & Chauhan, A. (2024). Exploring the connection between emotional intelligence and resilience: qualitative findings and perspectives. Sachetas, 3(4), 1–7. https://doi.org/10.55955/340001

Khazaei, M. M., Shamoradiy, R., Niromand, E., & Khazaei, M. R. (2024). The State of Moral Intelligence of Medical Students of Kermanshah University of Medical Sciences in 2022. Educational Research in Medical Sciences Journal, 12(2), e138729. https://doi.org/10.5812/ermsj-138729

Lakshmi, P. S. (2024). The Relevance of Values Education in Today's Higher Education, Journal of Research in Vocational Education, 6*(11), 6–9. https://doi.org/10.53469/jrve.2024.6

Luthar, S. S., Lyman, E. L., & Crossman, E. J. (2014). Resilience and Positive Psychology (pp. 125–140). Springer, Boston, MA. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4614-9608-3_7

Mohammadi, M., Mohammadi, S., Mehri, A., & Bagheri Mazraeh, F. (2020). Investigation of moral intelligence's predictive components in students of Shahid Beheshti university of medical sciences (SBMU). Journal of Medical Ethics and History of Medicine, 13, 13. https://doi.org/10.18502/JMEHM.V13I13.4389

Muhtadi, A. (2011). Development of moral attitudes and behavior of students in learning activities at school. 7(1), 219891. https://journal.uny.ac.id/index.php/mip/article/download/3217/2696

Mukhamedaly, S. B., BAŞ, Ö., & Kuralbayeva, A. (2024). The Importance of Values Education and Its Impact on Character Development. A. Âsaui Atyndaġy Halyķaralyķ Ķazaķ-Tùrìk Universitetìniṇ Habaršysy, 134(4), 412–422. https://doi.org/10.47526/2024-4/2664-0686.131

Özsarı A, Görücü A. (2023). Moral decision-making attitude and psychological well-being: reflections from various sports branches. Physical Education of Students. 2023;27(5):294-302. https://doi.org/10.15561/20755279.2023.0509

Pan, L., Wang, J., Pang, M., Wang, W., Zhou, Y., Chen, R., Liu, H., Xu, X., Su, B., Nie, L., Zhao, J., Li, S., Li, J., Li, H., & Kong, F. (2024). Addressing psychological resilience and its determinants among university students during the COVID-19 pandemic: a three-wave longitudinal study in Shandong Province, China. BMC Psychiatry, 24(1), 823. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-024-06175-3

Rao, G., Koneru, A., Nebhineni, N., & Mishra, K. (2024). Developing resilience and harnessing emotional intelligence. Indian Journal of Psychiatry, 66(Suppl 2):p S255-S26. https://doi.org/10.4103/indianjpsychiatry.indianjpsychiatry_601_23

Romzi, M. A., Abdullah, N., & Yusof, A. (2024). Integrated Islamic teaching in education: A pathway to enhanced moral commitment. *Journal of Islamic Education Research, 8(3), 45–60.

Rushton, C. H. (2024). Conceptualizing Moral Resilience', in Cynda Hylton Rushton (ed.), Moral Resilience: Transforming Moral Suffering in Healthcare, 2nd edn (New York, 2024; online edn, Oxford Academic, 19 Sept. 2024), https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780197667149.003.0007.

Samol, A. (2024). TOWARDS STUDENTS' CHARACTER AND MORAL AWAKENANCE: Collaboration and Challenges in Religious Values-Based Education. CONSCIENTIA: Jurnal Teologi Kristen, 3(1). https://doi.org/10.60157/conscientia.v3i1.50

Sayed, M. A. A. (2022). Moral Intelligence and its Relationship to Academic Entitlement and Academic Performance of Secondary School Students. European Journal of Educational Research, 11(4), 2291–2301. https://doi.org/10.12973/eu-jer.11.4.2291

Sofiani, I. K., Nabila, N., Neviani, N., & Syalini, S. (2024). Islamic Educational Thought in Building Students' Emotional Intelligence. International Journal of Innovative Research in Multidisciplinary Education, 03(05). https://doi.org/10.58806/ijirme.2024.v3i5n26

Suharyat, Y., Resky, M. ., Khasanah, U. ., Malika, E. ., Putri, T. A. ., & Almaqsum, M. F. . (2023). The Influence of Religious Activities and Social Intelligence to Form Students' Religious Character. JIIP - Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Pendidikan, 6(12), 10972-10977. https://doi.org/10.54371/jiip.v6i12.3613

Thaddeus, L. B. (2024). The Mediating Role of Emotional Stability and Social Skills in Psychological Resilience Following Emotional Trauma. Studies in Psychological Science, 2(3), 26–34. https://doi.org/10.56397/sps.2024.09.04

Varghese, R. M. (2024). POSITIVE PSYCHOLOGY & RESILIENCE (pp. 47–54). https://doi.org/10.58532/v3bfms1p2ch2

Vella, S.-L. C., & Pai, N. B. (2019). A theoretical review of psychological resilience: Defining resilience and resilience research over the decades. Archives of Medicine and Health Sciences, 7(2), 233–239. https://doi.org/10.4103/AMHS.AMHS_119_19

Wu, Y., Yu, W., Wu, X., Wan, H., Wang, Y., & Lu, G. (2020). Psychological resilience and positive coping styles among Chinese undergraduate students: a cross-sectional study. BMC Psychology, 8(1), 79. https://doi.org/10.1186/S40359-020-00444-Y

Zhang, J., Liu, H., & Dai, W. (2024). Physical exercise and positive coping styles of Chinese college students: Psychological resilience as a mediator. Social Behavior and Personality, 52(5),13098E-13106E (9). https://doi.org/10.2224/sbp.13098

Zhou, Y., & Hu, X. (2020). Psychological Capital, Positive Moral Education and Improvement of College Students' Ideological & Moral Qualities. Advances in Social Science, Education and Humanities Research, 810–814. https://doi.org/10.2991/ASSEHR.K.201214.615.