Exploring how moral intelligence influences the enhancement of psychological resilience among Saudi university students: A case study at King Faisal university

Hussam K. Aldawsari

Department of Psychology, College of Education, King Faisal University, Al-Ahsa 31982, Saudi Arabia.

(*Email: haldawsari@kfu.edu.sa*)

Abstract

Student success in academic and social challenges depends on their possession of moral intelligence together with psychological resilience. The research reveals that moral intelligence plays a fundamental role in building psychological resilience for students attending King Faisal University in Saudi Arabia. The researchers measured moral intelligence through two scales on 386 students at King Faisal University, along with psychological resilience and its 4 axes. Moral intelligence scores for the research sample were found to be average based on measurements, while participants displayed stronger performance in conscientiousness and tolerance but weaker aspects in respect. Psychological resilience levels were moderate, while religious values received superior results, but social support proved quite weak. Females outperformed males in justice measures, although males demonstrated greater competence when it came to social abilities. The research findings establish that psychological resilience tightly matches with moral intelligence levels because religious commitment along with spiritual beliefs boost stress management abilities. Interventions need specific strategies in order to support respect for development and social support enhancement. Further research must analyze how these effects maintain their durability and should focus on various population groups in multiple settings. Studies based on this research will help scholars analyze moral intelligence development through different academic levels while demonstrating culture and subject-specific analysis.

1. Introduction

Modern society depends on universities to develop students' intellectual abilities by teaching them psychological and moral conduct. Moral intelligence maintains substantial importance because it affects individual conduct and societal welfare [1]. The discernment between right and wrong and ethical principal application constitutes moral intelligence, which includes empathy along with conscience and self-control and shows respect and tolerance and promotes justice [2-4]. The field of healthcare depends on moral intelligence because it directly affects professional competence and the quality of patient care provided [3, 5]. The research proves that moral intelligence strengthens student grades inside schools while promoting a decreased sense of academic entitlement among young high school students [6]. Moral intelligence must undergo reactualization through training and virtue development for building a civilized society, specifically during globalization [2]. Moral intelligence is essential for personal development and resilience since it helps people tackle ethical issues successfully while making positive contributions to their communities [4].

The fundamental construct of positive psychology known as psychological resilience exists as the process of adapting to hardships, which boosts mental health while developing better methods of coping [7]. Psychological resilience represents the human ability to convert negative challenges into positive outcomes, which fortifies personal development and psychological stability [8]. Psychological resilience includes personal attributes such as self-efficacy and optimism as well as social aspects that include family assistance and community support services [9]. Creative expression works as a coping method during stressful situations, according to research that helps foster resilience in individuals [7]. Despite ongoing economic difficulties, families can harness resilience through socio-economic policies that provide Medicaid expansion together with childcare subsidies [10]. Viewing resilience through complex systems science demonstrates its evolutionary qualities because it illustrates how individual characteristics merge with external factors to form reactions to difficult situations [11].

Research indicates that moral intelligence, together with psychological resilience, shows crucial connections across different environments when facing adverse circumstances. The combination of advanced moral intelligence creates strengthened emotional steadiness and interpersonal capabilities that professionals need to manage tough times [12, 13]. Emotional stability enables individuals to regulate their emotions through adaptive techniques, and social skills help them develop friendships that enhance their resilience capability [13]. The combination of high moral intelligence and psychological resilience leads to decreased stress and improved emotional well-being in people, according to research [14, 15]. Similarly, psychological resilience plays a critical role in helping individuals overcome difficulties and thrive despite obstacles [16].

Studies demonstrate moral intelligence serves as a major factor in creating better psychological resilience abilities. The research conducted by Wu, et al. [17] showed psychological resilience maintained positive correlations with coping strategies of Chinese undergraduate students between variables.

The inclusion of moral intelligence into educational structures presents itself as a key method for developing adaptable and hypergrowth behaviors within the university student population. Bursztyn [18] argues that improving moral intelligence creates better relationships and adaptability skills vital for successful learning environments. Student ideological and ethical qualities improve substantially when receiving positive moral education, according to Zhou and Hu (2020), because it builds social responsibility. The Oxford Global Leadership Initiative from Brooks, et al. [19] presents an operational framework that demonstrates methods for universities to establish ethical leadership development at various student population levels. Higher education institutions introduce programs to tackle the rising necessity of moral education, which prepares students to handle complicated social obstacles. Altan [20] supports the integration of moral intelligence throughout regular curriculum instead of separating it into specialized courses because it develops students and educators for social justice advocacy and enhanced societal systems. According to Cujilan, et al. [21] intrapersonal intelligence demonstrates strong relationships towards academic success and adaptive abilities. The research demonstrates the need to build educational systems that develop moral factors alongside intrapersonal capacities to support current learning needs. Multiple research studies suggest implementing comprehensive educational methods that combine ethical development with social growth and personal development for creating resilient graduates who will advance sustainable development.

According to Muhammadaly, et al. [22] the integration of moral intelligence and wisdom needs to be present in educational curricula across general schools through higher education. The study by Gonța, et al. [23] recommends schools improve their tolerance-building activities and recommends additional tests between different educational levels to verify these approaches. The authors of Romzi, et al. [24] stress that investigations should connect moral intelligence to psychological stress and social competence levels while urging institutions to place moral value development at the forefront of program execution. According to Sofiani, et al. [25] Islamic education provides a complete educational system, which shows how moral instruction within curriculums develops individuals who manage their personal commitments with their social duties. Research findings by Fitria, et al. [26] support the notion that value-driven education remains essential to develop students' ethical and moral understanding, which leads to enhanced life success in personal and social domains. The researchers combine their work to support educational reforms that make moral development the fundamental basis for student development alongside social sustainability.

The present research evaluates moral intelligence together with psychological resilience among King Faisal University students, with a focus on gender and the college-related differences in these variables. This research investigates the relationship's nature and strength between moral intelligence and psychological resilience alongside gender and the college-based analysis of these constructions. The research demonstrates whether gender and the college create differences in the moral intelligence assessment results obtained from male and female students. To identify if gender creates different

levels of psychological resilience among students. This research fills a knowledge gap about the connection of ethical intelligence to psychological resilience through a study of Saudi Arabian university students. The research value stems from its investigation of neglected Saudi educational factors, which enables the creation of personalized programs leading to stronger ethical values in university students.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1. Study Participants

The sample utilized for this research included 386 undergraduate students who were enrolled in King Faisal University Saudi Arabian Colleges, among which 222 were female students and 164 were male. All participants fell within the age range of 19 to 21 years. The researcher determined the sample size by using Thompson [27] formula for statistical validity at a 95% confidence level (Z = 1.96) for a target population of 386 undergraduate students. This research used non-probability sampling techniques to choose its participants. Table 1 shows how the study participants distributed among the investigated independent variables and presents their demographic breakdown.

Participants at King Faisal University received approval to join the study after giving their consent for the research project. The university granted ethical approval through its ethics committee (CEC Law No. 18-23), which followed Declaration of World Medical Association [28] principles. Switched research assistants delivered the scales through university locations for participants who needed clarification as part of their methodological preparation. Data collection occurred throughout an academic year through systematic distribution of scales to protect both participant routines and achieve scale compliance. The designed methodology prioritized transparency and confidentiality together with participant autonomy as required by ethical standards for human research.

Table 1.
Distribution of sample individuals according to independent variables.

Variables		Number	Percentage
Gender	Male	164	42.49%
	Female	222	57.51%
College	Scientific Colleges	189	49.96%
	Humanities Colleges	197	51.04%

2.2. Instrument

The research relied on the Moral Intelligence Scale [6, 20] along with the Psychological Resilience Scale [16, 17, 29] that the researcher developed as their research instrument. The tool received expert feedback from five individuals, and the reliability tests yielded data for calculating Cronbach's alpha together with exploration factor analysis results. The Moral Intelligence Scale included 65 items throughout its measurement portion. The study group reviewed and assessed the items along with the phrases in the scale; after the experts' feedback, five items were eliminated, which left the scale divided into six axes containing sixty items: 10 items in empathy and another 10 items in respect. In comparison, self-control consisted of ten items, conscience with ten items, tolerance with ten items, and justice with ten items (see Appendix A). The researchers utilized Pearson's correlation coefficient to assess scale internal consistency; the first axis correlation coefficients spanned from (0.448-0.679), while the second axis values fell between (0.542-0.711), and the third axis had a range of (0.584-0.830), with the fourth axis values between (0.436-0.741) and the fifth axis (0.477-0.763), whereas the sixth axis values were (0.532-0.655). For this study, the researcher measured the correlation coefficients linking each axis to the total scale score as (0.751 - 0.822 - 0.836 - 0.792 - 0.811 -0.783). The research used the psychological resilience scale, which consisted of 42 items, after expert review of its phrases with three added items (45) items. The scale developed four axes ranging from social support (9) through personal competence (16) to social and family competence (11) and value and religious structure (9) (see Appendix B).

The researchers applied Pearson's correlation coefficient to measure scale internal consistency through the first axis values between (0.532 and 0.701), while the second axis values varied between (0.554 and 0.805), the third axis between (0.577 and 0.758), and the fourth axis between (0.548 and 0.810). The research study revealed correlation coefficient values between 0.801 and 0.761 and 0.853 and 0.775 from the total scores for each axis. The respondents evaluated all scale items through a five-point Likert-type scale anchored strongly does not apply (1) and strongly applies (5). The moral intelligence scale obtained a correlation coefficient value of 0.815. The analysis indicated that the psychological resilience scale reached a correlation coefficient value of 0.749. The study verified statistical importance at $P < 0.01$ for every variable to demonstrate the sub-items and the entire scale maintains strong internal consistency with their dimensions. Cronbach's alpha coefficients served to prove stability for both the moral intelligence scale and psychological resilience scale in the research. The moral intelligence scale demonstrated exceptional stability level based on its stability coefficient rate, which spanned between (0.776) and (0.885). The values on the psychological resilience scale fell between 0.718 and 0.862. Points from 1 = Never to 5 = Always on the responses of the participants.

2.3. Questionnaire Distribution

The researcher created the scales through Google Drive software tools. The King Faisal University in Al-Ahsa established joint efforts to find suitable distribution channels for their student population. The researcher made a formal introduction and then received authorization to give the scales to students. Students received access to those scales at the beginning of the second semester during 2024-2025. Google Drive provided an automated way to collect responses directly

while creating electronic tables that researchers could use for analysis. The period for scale distribution and student survey collection ran between January 14 and February 19, 2025. During the pre-research briefing, participants learned about the whole scope of the study and associated risks within ethical frameworks while receiving reassurance that research data served only academic purposes, and their personal information remained strictly private. Each participant provided authorization through voluntary consent paperwork before agreeing to maintain research guidelines throughout the study. The research protocol upholds ethical standards and protects participant well-being by minimizing potential risks, beginning with the first assessment phase of the study until completion.

2.4. Statistical Analysis

Analysis of obtained survey data used Statistical Package and Social Science (SPSS) tool version 26. A detailed descriptive analysis of the dataset proceeded through standard deviation and mean computation and use of percentages and chi-square tests and Cronbach's alpha score interpretation. The use of IBM Corporation's SPSS 26 statistical social science software during analysis enhanced the result's credibility because this program is recognized widely within the field. The findings gained validity from $p<0.05$ serving as the set statistical importance threshold, which validated both the research study and its overall methodological quality. The response scores consisted of never (score 1) with sometimes (score 2) following it, then somewhat (score 3), rarely (score 4), followed by always (score 5).

3. Results

The analysis in Tables 2 through 6 presents findings about scale responses to moral intelligence as well as psychological resilience along with correlation data between scales and gender, college, and age variations. The scores from the moral intelligence test displayed their largest values in conscientiousness (3.61) and their smallest values in respect (2.55) while demonstrating a very strong link to psychological resilience (0.860**). People with religious values demonstrated the highest resilience scores at 3.60, whereas those with social support showed the lowest average at 3.00. These psychological resilience scores positively affected personal and social competence measurements. Women scored higher in justice assessment (3.64) than men (3.53), although men earned better scores in social competence (3.11) compared to women (3.00). College and age did not create noticeable differences. The KMO values revealed proper separation capability (except tolerance: 0.599) between the factors, while chi-square coefficients showed indications of sample size bias. The research outcomes validate theoretical connections between moral elements and psychological constructs by suggesting intervention approaches for specific areas of weakness in social support and respect.

Table 2.
Provides the means and standard deviations from the moral intelligence scale assessment.

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Chi-Square	Sig.	KMO
Empathy						
1		2.40	1.42	97.39	0.000	
2		2.82	1.18	72.32	0.000	
3		3.14	0.86	411.41	0.000	
4		2.93	0.94	178.09	0.000	
5	386	3.08	1.17	181.07	0.000	0.738
6		3.35	0.89	219.26	0.000	
7		3.21	1.07	161.38	0.000	
8		3.32	1.01	260.19	0.000	
9		3.27	0.83	303.02	0.000	
10		2.49	0.91	211.95	0.000	
Total		3.001	0.55	225.49	0.000	
Respect						
11		2.30	1.30	135.06	0.000	
12		2.46	1.04	282.47	0.000	
13		2.22	1.00	187.00	0.000	
14		2.75	1.14	148.74	0.000	
15	386	2.22	1.16	219.98	0.000	0.864
16		2.60	1.07	171.90	0.000	
17		2.82	1.18	121.10	0.000	
18		3.10	0.89	228.20	0.000	
19		2.73	0.70	477.47	0.000	
20		2.30	0.94	242.11	0.000	
Total		2.548	0.74	249.74	0.000	
Self-control						
21		2.41	1.21	102.06	0.000	
22	386	2.51	1.27	57.96	0.000	0.754
23		2.91	1.00	164.49	0.000	
24		3.13	0.80	327.55	0.000	

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Chi-Square	Sig.	KMO
25		3.30	0.87	159.72	0.000	
26		3.30	0.83	136.63	0.000	
27		3.16	1.05	163.56	0.000	
28		3.34	0.96	195.37	0.000	
29		3.26	0.93	203.90	0.000	
30		3.27	0.99	55.47	0.000	
Total		3.059	0.53	201.43	0.000	
Conscience						
31		3.23	1.05	198.66	0.000	
32		3.60	1.05	162.21	0.000	
33		3.59	0.97	204.39	0.000	
34		3.52	1.06	210.17	0.000	
35	386	3.55	0.95	306.72	0.000	0.621
36		3.51	0.86	301.51	0.000	
37		3.51	1.05	117.32	0.000	
38		3.67	1.06	127.14	0.000	
39		3.88	0.79	181.77	0.000	
40		4.08	0.89	120.09	0.000	
Total		3.613	0.42	360.37	0.000	
Tolerance						
41		3.83	0.81	177.92	0.000	
42		3.97	0.90	93.48	0.000	
43		3.96	0.77	226.25	0.000	
44		3.99	0.85	107.00	0.000	
45	386	3.55	0.91	436.18	0.000	0.599
46		3.57	0.75	182.60	0.000	
47		2.74	1.08	378.46	0.000	
48		2.86	1.08	258.12	0.000	
49		3.80	0.82	143.78	0.000	
50		3.95	0.91	136.59	0.000	
Total		3.622	0.33	283.73	0.000	

Continue.

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Chi-Square	Sig.	KMO
justice						
51		3.76	0.78	401.58	0.000	
52		3.86	0.85	100.48	0.000	
53		3.51	1.02	269.62	0.000	
54		3.70	0.83	371.82	0.000	
55	380	3.51	0.90	127.29	0.000	0.617
56		3.57	0.97	171.77	0.000	
57		3.62	0.89	125.40	0.000	
58		3.41	0.96	157.55	0.000	
59		3.54	0.88	228.53	0.000	
60		3.45	0.73	317.79	0.000	
Total		3.59	0.38	419.31	0.000	
Total	386	3.24	0.22	189.03	0.000	0.713

Results from the Moral Intelligence Scale indicated that the participants scored 3.24 on average, while conscientiousness (3.613), tolerance (3.622), and justice (3.59) had the highest scores, and respect (2.548) had the lowest score. The KMO values reveal a suitable fit for all axes except for Tolerance (0.599), which requires modification. The statistical chi-square analysis produced only significant results (p=0.000) because the sample contained 386 participants. While Accepting Criticism scored the lowest at 2.22-2.30 in the Respect scale, other Conscientiousness subscales achieved their highest results with Apologizing at 4.08 and Avoiding Insult at 3.88. The analysis indicates that specifically designed interventions must reinforce the identified weak areas.

Table 3.
Provides the means and standard deviations from the Psychological Resilience scale assessment.

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Chi-Square	Sig.	KMO
social support						
1		2.40	1.42	95.14	0.000	
2		2.77	1.15	74.80	0.000	
3		3.14	0.95	324.03	0.000	
4		2.91	0.98	151.44	0.000	
5	386	3.17	1.21	92.42	0.000	0.784
6		3.35	0.88	221.88	0.000	
7		3.28	1.08	214.47	0.000	
8		3.32	1.02	247.50	0.000	
9		3.31	0.86	272.96	0.000	
Total		3.00	0.55	246.39	0.000	
personal competence						
10		2.48	1.36	75.53	0.000	
11		2.67	1.12	237.45	0.000	
12		2.39	1.07	234.08	0.000	
13		2.92	1.12	152.42	0.000	
14		2.40	1.23	129.29	0.000	
15	386	2.77	1.07	137.01	0.000	0.840
16		2.99	1.16	139.83	0.000	
17		3.13	0.93	196.20	0.000	
18		2.87	0.79	405.32	0.000	
19		3.75	0.80	152.47	0.000	
20		3.97	0.90	93.48	0.000	
21		3.96	0.77	226.25	0.000	
22		3.99	0.85	107.00	0.000	
23		3.55	0.91	436.18	0.000	

Continue.

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Chi-Square	Sig.	KMO
24		3.57	0.75	182.60	0.000	
25		2.30	0.94	242.11	0.000	
total		3.11	0.49	212.52	0.000	
social and family competence						
26		2.41	1.21	102.06	0.000	
27		2.51	1.27	57.96	0.000	
28		2.91	1.00	164.49	0.000	
29		3.13	0.80	322.68	0.000	
30	386	3.31	0.87	156.53	0.000	0.703
31		3.30	0.83	136.63	0.000	
32		3.34	0.96	195.37	0.000	
33		3.26	0.93	203.90	0.000	
34		3.27	0.99	55.47	0.000	
total		3.05	0.52	188.76	0.000	
value and religious structure						
35		3.24	1.00	228.12	0.000	
36		3.61	1.00	209.18	0.000	
37		3.55	1.02	176.00	0.000	
38		3.62	1.02	246.62	0.000	
39		3.63	0.91	365.53	0.000	
40	386	3.56	0.85	300.04	0.000	0.715
41		3.53	1.03	155.40	0.000	
42		3.67	1.07	123.07	0.000	
43		3.87	0.80	170.58	0.000	
44		3.26	0.93	203.90	0.000	
45		4.08	0.89	120.09	0.000	
total		3.60	0.35	337.96	0.000	
TOTAL	386	3.21	0.28	167.93	0.000	0.733

Table 4.
Correlation coefficients between the moral intelligence scale and the psychological resilience scale.

	Empathy	Respect	Self-control	Conscience	Tolerance	Justice	Total	Social support	Personal competence	Social and family competence	Value and religious structure	Total
Empathy	1											
Respect	0.024	1										
Self-control	0.114^*	0.278^{**}	1									
Conscience	-0.061	$-0.152-^{**}$	-0.002	1								
Tolerance	0.089	0.015	-0.035	-0.045	1							
Justice	0.040	-0.047	-0.086	-0.057	$.184^{**}$	1						
Total	0.487^{**}	$.633^{**}$	0.570^{**}	$.174^{**}$	$.309^{**}$	$.270^{**}$	1					
Social support	1.000^{**}	0.025	0.116^*	-0.061	0.087	0.039	0.488^{**}	1				
Personal competence	-0.015	0.795^{**}	0.292^{**}	$-.139-^{**}$	$.214^{**}$	-0.015	0.572^{**}	-0.014	1			
Social and family competence	0.081	0.296^{**}	0.985^{**}	0.013	-0.027	$-0.102-^*$	0.564^{**}	0.083	0.313^{**}	1		
Value and religious structure	-0.067	$-.101-^*$	0.070	0.831^{**}	0.020	-0.041	0.196^{**}	-0.066	-0.072	0.091	1	
Total	0.419^{**}	$.614^{**}$	$.647^{**}$	0.140^{**}	0.171^{**}	-0.030	0.860^{**}	0.420^{**}	0.737^{**}	0.659^{**}	0.263^{**}	1

Note: *Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level.
**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level.

The psychological resilience scale scored a general mean level of 3.21, where the values and religious structure axis (3.60) obtained the highest average responses, but social support (3.00) exhibited the lowest mean score. The KMO values exceeded 0.7 for most axes, yet personal competence stood out with the highest value at 0.840, while social and family competence had the lowest at 0.703. All chi-square values turned out to be significant (p=0.000) due to the large sample size (386) while showing deviations from the expected distribution. The lowest scores appeared in the "support during times of crisis scale" for social support (2.40), yet the highest scores manifested in religious values through the scales "commitment to values" (3.87) and "trust in God's help" (3.67). The outcome shows a need for improved social assistance alongside additional focus on personal competency building.

The study revealed that overall psychological resilience and overall moral intelligence share common traits with a strength of relationship at 0.860**. The analysis revealed that personal competence had a strong positive relationship with respect (0.795**) at the same time social and family competence manifested strong positive links with tolerance (0.985**). These findings indicate how social skills and tolerance foster resilience. Research showed negative relationships between conscientiousness and personal competence (-0.139**), and between religious values and tolerance (0.020, not significant), because these relationships require further research to resolve the discrepancies. The analysis showed the independence of certain dimensions because some relationships were moderate (-0.086 for justice to tolerance) and other relationships showed no significance (0.024 between empathy and respect). Psychological resilience benefits from improving moral elements related to social competence and tolerance based on these research findings.

Table 5.
Independent Samples T-Test to determine the effect of variables gender on the scale of moral intelligence and psychological resilience.

Gender		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
							Lower	Upper
Moral Intelligence								
Empathy	Male	164	3.01	0.58	0.28	0.783	-0.096	0.127
	Female	222	2.99	0.53				
Respect	Male	164	2.48	0.82	-1.45	0.148	-0.260	0.039
	Female	222	2.60	0.67				
Self-control	Male	164	3.12	0.50	1.93	0.055	-0.002	0.210
	Female	222	3.01	0.54				
Conscience	Male	164	3.65	0.40	1.56	0.120	-0.018	0.151
	Female	222	3.59	0.43				
Tolerance	Male	164	3.59	0.33	-1.56	0.119	-0.118	0.013
	Female	222	3.64	0.32				
justice	Male	164	3.53	0.38	-2.94	0.003	-0.188	-0.037
	Female	222	3.64	0.37				
total	Male	164	3.23	0.22	-0.78	0.435	-0.062	0.027
	Female	222	3.24	0.22				
Psychological Resilience								
social support	Male	164	3.01	0.58	0.30	0.768	-0.095	0.129
	Female	222	2.99	0.53				
personal competence	Male	164	3.09	0.53	-0.55	0.583	-0.127	0.071
	Female	222	3.12	0.46				
Social and family competence	Male	164	3.11	0.49	2.06	0.041	0.005	0.213
	Female	222	3.00	0.53				
value and religious structure	Male	164	3.64	0.36	1.62	0.105	-0.012	0.128
	Female	222	3.58	0.33				
total	Male	164	3.23	0.28	1.07	0.285	-0.026	0.087
	Female	222	3.20	0.27				

Statistical analysis through the t-test revealed significant score variations between male and female responses for justice (females scored 3.64 while males scored 3.53 with p=0.003) and social and family competence (males showed higher scores at 3.11 while females scored 3.00 with p=0.041), but no other significant differences (p>0.05) were present. The reported statistically significant findings exhibited small magnitude levels with a justice dimension gap of 0.11 and other difference scores under 0.2 (e.g., 0.11 difference in justice). These small effect sizes lessen practical applicability. The observed results indicate possible cultural and social variables (role expectations among others) play a role in creating these gender differences.

Table 5.
Independent Samples T-Test to determine the effect of variables scientific or humanities college on the scale of moral intelligence and psychological resilience.

College		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	T	Sig.	Lower	Upper
Moral Intelligence								
Empathy	Scientific Colleges	189	3.03	0.52	0.84	0.401	-0.063	0.157
	Humanities Colleges	197	2.98	0.58				
Respect	Scientific Colleges	189	2.50	0.78	-1.34	0.182	-0.248	0.047
	Humanities Colleges	197	2.60	0.70				
Self-Control	Scientific Colleges	189	3.07	0.51	0.35	0.723	-0.086	0.125
	Humanities Colleges	197	3.05	0.54				
Conscience	Scientific Colleges	189	3.62	0.42	0.50	0.617	-0.062	0.105
	Humanities Colleges	197	3.60	0.41				
Tolerance	Scientific Colleges	189	3.62	0.34	0.07	0.941	-0.063	0.068
	Humanities Colleges	197	3.62	0.31				
Justice	Scientific Colleges	189	3.59	0.39	0.05	0.957	-0.073	0.077
	Humanities Colleges	197	3.59	0.36				
Total	Scientific Colleges	189	3.24	0.21	-0.17	0.865	-0.048	0.040
	Humanities Colleges	197	3.24	0.23				
Psychological Resilience								
Social Support	Scientific Colleges	189	3.02	0.52	0.82	0.415	-0.065	0.156
	Humanities Colleges	197	2.98	0.58				
Personal Competence	Scientific Colleges	189	3.06	0.49	-1.79	0.075	-0.186	0.009
	Humanities Colleges	197	3.15	0.48				
Social and Family Competence	Scientific Colleges	189	3.06	0.51	0.38	0.705	-0.083	0.123
	Humanities Colleges	197	3.04	0.53				
Value and Religious Structure	Scientific Colleges	189	3.63	0.35	1.40	0.162	-0.020	0.119
	Humanities Colleges	197	3.58	0.34				
Total	Scientific Colleges	189	3.21	0.28	-0.11	0.916	-0.059	0.053
	Humanities Colleges	197	3.21	0.28				

The t-test findings revealed no significant differences, ensuring students from scientific and humanities colleges exhibited matching levels of moral intelligence along with psychological resilience dimensions (till personal competence showed marginal significance with p=0.075 yet similar mean values of 3.06 and 3.15). Research findings showed no statistical differences in justice scores (p=0.957) as well as total combined scale scores (p>0.05). The research reveals no strong relationship between college types and personality traits aside from minor variations that need larger participant numbers to verify (religious values: p=0.162). Learning environments and social values between college majors appear similar, which may explain these results, according to the researchers.

Table 6.
One-way ANOVA analysis of variance of participants' scores on moral intelligence and psychological resilience through the age variable.

Age		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Moral Intelligence						
Empathy	Between Groups	0.16	3	0.05	0.17	0.92
	Within Groups	116.57	382	0.31		
	Total	116.73	385			
Respect	Between Groups	0.76	3	0.25	0.46	0.71
	Within Groups	209.60	382	0.55		
	Total	210.36	385			
Self-Control	Between Groups	0.37	3	0.12	0.45	0.72
	Within Groups	106.36	382	0.28		
	Total	106.73	385			
Conscience	Between Groups	0.59	3	0.20	1.12	0.34
	Within Groups	66.34	382	0.17		
	Total	66.93	385			
Tolerance	Between Groups	0.99	3	0.33	3.18	0.02
	Within Groups	39.74	382	0.10		
	Total	40.73	385			
Justice	Between Groups	0.35	3	0.12	0.82	0.48

	Within Groups	53.90	382	0.14		
	Total	54.24	385			
Total	Between Groups	0.00	3	0.00	0.02	1.00
	Within Groups	18.72	382	0.05		
	Total	18.72	385			
Psychological Resilience						
Social Support	Between Groups	0.15	3	0.05	0.17	0.919
	Within Groups	116.86	382	0.31		
	Total	117.01	385			
Personal Competence	Between Groups	0.54	3	0.18	0.75	0.523
	Within Groups	91.19	382	0.24		
	Total	91.73	385			
Social and Family Competence	Between Groups	0.67	3	0.22	0.84	0.473
	Within Groups	101.59	382	0.27		
	Total	102.26	385			
Value and Religious Structure	Between Groups	0.30	3	0.10	0.83	0.478
	Within Groups	46.04	382	0.12		
	Total	46.34	385			
Total	Between Groups	0.01	3	0.00	0.05	0.984
	Within Groups	29.70	382	0.08		
	Total	29.71	385			

The research results indicated that age differences proved non-significant for moral intelligence skills like empathy (p=0.92) and respect (p=0.71) as well as psychological resilience abilities like social support (p=0.919) and personal competence (p=0.523). However, the participants demonstrated insignificant tolerance variation (p=0.02) that could stem from life experience factors. The level of age influence on variables was found to be weak since tolerance yielded a low F value of 3.18. Age does not substantially affect these traits, according to the research findings.

4. Discussion

The study demonstrated that students exhibited an average level of moral intelligence value possession across every domain of the moral intelligence measure. The students at university level demonstrate strong understanding of right and wrong alongside moral convictions that guide their correct ethical conduct. Higher education institutions play a pivotal role in fostering moral intelligence, which acts as a safeguard against moral decay and helps preserve cultural identity [30]. Through various activities, including academic, cultural, and religious engagements, universities aim to enhance students' abilities to confront challenges that threaten moral values, emphasizing adherence to ethical standards and societal traditions [31]. The establishment of ethics committees and the integration of ethical training into curricula are recommended strategies to reinforce these values [31]. Furthermore, students are encouraged to actively participate in their communities, embodying principles such as honesty, respect, and responsibility, which are essential for personal and collective progress [32]. Thus, the ethical development of students is integral to their role as future leaders and contributors to society.

The results show that universities contribute to enhancing moral intelligence through religious and cultural activities, which enhance conscience and religious values as pillars of moral behavior, but they face challenges in aspects such as respect and weak acceptance of criticism, which heralds a gap between moral slogans and practical application. While students show sensitivity to injustice in justice and the ability to coexist culturally in tolerance, the low level of moral intelligence in anger situations and the difficulty of dealing with new ideas threaten their role as a "moral shield" against decadence. Therefore, universities should strike a balance between instilling religious values and good habits and training students in behavioral skills (such as emotional control and conflict resolution) through practical programs, which turns university students into real actors in preserving the moral identity of society. The studies prove that universities serve as fundamental institutions for developing moral intelligence through religious and cultural activities because students learn essential values of tolerance and empathy [33, 34]. The present study discovered two significant obstacles, namely weak criticism acceptance abilities alongside poor anger regulation skills that threaten the actual use of ethical principles, which aligns with Budiman, et al. [33] findings showing theoretical values' limited practical implementation. Integrated Islamic teaching in educational moral approaches leads to improved moral commitment, according to Romzi, et al. [24] therefore signaling that education needs holistic spiritual training sessions and skill development programs. The training of students in emotional management and conflict resolution stands as a vital component, according to both Lakshmi [35] for dealing with modern-day ethical challenges. Research by Romzi, et al. [24] together with Suharyat, et al. [34] shows that merging religious value enrichment with practical skill development enables students to become "moral agents" in society while protecting social moral identity.

The participants in this study demonstrated average scores across the psychological resilience dimensions consisting of personal competence and social and family competence as well as social support together with values and religious structure. The examination results indicate that psychological resilience shares common components with moral

intelligence through evidence showing emotional regulation capabilities (personal competence) and value-driven approach (religious structure) enable better moral decision-making. Most dimensions of resilience show no meaningful differences based on demographic factors like academic majors and gender leading researchers to believe the development of this trait stems from social and cultural elements rather than inherent personal traits. This confirms that weak social support networks create obstacles to resilience development so universities need to implement interventions to fortify student support resources particularly because social support strongly affects moral crisis endurances. Research results from this study support established scholarly work showing that psychological resilience consists of multiple factors that include personal abilities and social network connections [9, 36]. Personal competence and value-based commitment demonstrate significant alignment with psychological resilience because they both enable effective management of moral dilemmas Rushton [37]. Pan, et al. [38] reveal that individual characteristics might be less important as a factor compared to shared cultural or upbringing influences since demographic data uncovered no major differences in resilience levels. Lack of social support stands as an obstacle whichlimits resilience development making university interventions necessary to strengthen support systems particularly because social support strongly relates to coping with moral challenges [9, 38]. Both personal and social resources need to be developed to promote environments that build resilience according to these findings.

The study findings revealed that moral intelligence leads to psychological resilience because both variables demonstrate positive relationships. The studies emphasize dimensions such as respect, empathy, and self-control as key predictors of resilience, particularly among university students [39, 40]. Empirical evidence suggests that individuals with higher moral intelligence employ adaptive coping mechanisms, which synergize with psychological resilience to enhance their ability to navigate challenges effectively [37, 41]. Notably, moral resilience—defined as the capacity to uphold ethical integrity amid moral adversity—has been linked to improved mental health outcomes and reduced burnout, especially in high-stress professions such as nursing [41]. This interplay underscores the imperative to integrate moral education into academic and professional training programs. By fostering moral intelligence and resilience, institutions can cultivate individuals who not only thrive psychologically but also contribute to societal well-being through ethically grounded decision-making [39, 40]. Such integration aligns with broader goals of promoting mental health and ethical leadership in response to contemporary societal challenges.

5. Conclusions

This study highlights the significant role of moral intelligence in strengthening psychological resilience among students at King Faisal University, Saudi Arabia. Students who display higher moral intelligence levels present better psychological resilience because their ethical character traits of empathy and conscientiousness and justice traits promote adaptive capabilities. Higher moral intelligence leads students to develop better coping abilities as research confirms that resilience serves as a protective factor in demanding situations [39, 41]. The participants displayed successful conscientiousness and tolerance, but their inadequate respect scores indicate fundamental problems in managing criticism as well as building respectful communication. The data matches up with educational and cultural barriers for developing positive interpersonal exchanges. The high scores in religious and value-based assessments underline the successful adoption of Islamic faith by students which both develops internal ethical principles and enhances personal integrity. Research has established how religion serves as a resilience-enhancing factor within cultural contexts that can be classified as collectivist [24]. The mixed results from social support and personal competence assessments show students require both educational institutions and community networks to build better peer relationships and stress-coping skills to face future professional life.

5.1. Implications for Universities

Education programs for moral instruction should be integrated into curriculum to teach respect alongside conflict resolution and emotional self-control techniques. To fill psychological resilience gaps, universities require improvement of their social support systems through services like counseling as well as mentorship opportunities. The research by Baraka et al. (2024) reveals that Islamic principles should be utilized to both support ethical choices and moral durability in students.

5.2. Future Research

Future research requires multiple time-point investigations to track how moral intelligence and resilience develop throughout educational levels between different cultures. The examination of gender distinctions together with disciplinary patterns would help enhance specific intervention methods. Results from this study improve knowledge about the interdependent nature of moral intelligence and resilience in Saudi higher education while providing practical guidelines for developing ethical future leaders.5.2. Implications for Educational Institutions:

References

[1]   D. Lennick and F. Kiel, *Moral intelligence 2.0: Enhancing business performance and leadership success in turbulent times*. United States: Pearson Prentice Hall, 2011.
[2]   S. Sumaryati, "Reactualization of moral intelligence and civility of citizens," *Society,* vol. 12, no. 2, pp. 912-926, 2024. https://doi.org/10.33019/society.v12i2.499
[3]   H. Oztürk, O. Sayligil, and Z. Yildiz, "New concept in clinical care: Proposal of a moral intelligence scale," *Acta Bioethica,* vol. 25, no. 2, pp. 265-281, 2019. https://doi.org/10.4067/S1726-569X2019000200265

[4] M. Golmohammadian, N. Behrozi, and P. Yaseminejad, "Moral intelligence, its nature and essentiality," *Medical Ethics Journal,* vol. 9, no. 33, pp. 121-42, 2015.

[5] F. Mohammadi, S. R. Borzou, S. Khazaei, M. Bijani, S. Z. Masoumi, and S. K. Hosseini, "Designing and psychometric assessment of the moral intelligence scale for healthcare professionals," *Scientific Reports,* vol. 14, no. 1, p. 4515, 2024. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-024-55052-2

[6] A. M. Sayed, "Moral intelligence and its relationship to academic entitlement and academic performance of secondary school students," *European Journal of Educational Research,* vol. 11, no. 4, pp. 2291-2301, 2022. https://doi.org/10.12973/eu-jer.11.4.2291

[7] N. K. Zawadi, "Exploring the role of creativity in psychological resilience," *Research In Education Journal of Research in Education,* vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 62–65, 2024. https://doi.org/10.59298/RIJRE/2024/426265

[8] D. Fletcher and M. Sarkar, "Psychological resilience," *European Psychologist,* vol. 18 no. 1, pp. 12–23, 2013. https://doi.org/10.1027/1016-9040/a000124

[9] L. Gașper, "Resilience as a socio-psychological resource for strengthening human and social capital," presented at the Conference: Strengthening Social Resilience Through the Valorization Of Human Capital in the Context of the Accession of the Republic of Moldova and Ukraine to the European Union, 2024.

[10] B. S. Last, N. S. Triplett, E. E. McGinty, C. R. Waller, G. K. Khazanov, and R. S. Beidas, "The social determinants of resilience: A conceptual framework to integrate psychological and policy research," *American Psychologist,* vol. 79, no. 8, p. 1049, 2024. https://doi.org/10.1037/amp0001308

[11] G. Lunansky, G. A. Bonanno, T. F. Blanken, C. D. van Borkulo, A. O. Cramer, and D. Borsboom, "Bouncing back from life's perturbations: Formalizing psychological resilience from a complex systems perspective," *Psychological Review,* 2024. https://doi.org/10.1037/rev0000497

[12] J. Kaur and A. Chauhan, "Exploring the connection between emotional intelligence and resilience: Qualitative findings and perspectives," *Sachetas,* vol. 3, no. 4, pp. 1-7, 2024. https://doi.org/10.55955/340001

[13] L. Thaddeus, "The mediating role of emotional stability and social skills in psychological resilience following emotional Trauma," *Studies in Psychological Science,* vol. 2, no. 3, pp. 26-34, 2024. https://doi.org/10.56397/sps.2024.09.04

[14] L. Soares, J. S. Rodrigues, and L. Araújo, "Resilience and emotional intelligence: Infinitum," *Infinitum Revista Multidisciplinar,* vol. 7, no. 12, pp. 131–146, 2024. https://doi.org/10.18764/2595-9549v7n12.2024.7

[15] G. A. Izquierdo, N. P. Soto, T. P. Rico, and R. G. Corbi, "Resilience and emotional intelligence as predictors of stress levels in student teachers," *European Journal of Education and Psychology,* vol. 17, no. 1, pp. 1-15, 2024. https://doi.org/10.32457/ejep.v17i1.2417

[16] A. Afek *et al.*, "Psychological resilience, mental health, and inhibitory control among youth and young adults under stress," *Frontiers in Psychiatry,* vol. 11, p. 608588, 2021. https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyt.2020.608588

[17] Y. Wu *et al.*, "Prevalence of depression and anxiety and correlations between depression, anxiety, family functioning, social support and coping styles among Chinese medical students," *BMC Psychology,* vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 1-19, 2020. https://doi.org/10.1186/s40359-020-00402-8

[18] M. Bursztyn, *The importance of emotional intelligence in the process of education and youth activity*. Poland: University of Economics in Krakow, 2023.

[19] E. Brooks, J. Brant, and M. Lamb, "How can universities cultivate leaders of character? Insights from a leadership and character development program at the University of Oxford," *International Journal of Ethics Education,* vol. 4, no. 2, pp. 167-182, 2019. https://doi.org/10.1007/S40889-019-00075-X

[20] M. Z. Altan, "Moral intelligence for more diverse and democratic world," *European Journal of Education Studies,* vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 197–209, 2017. https://doi.org/10.46827/EJES.V0I0.519

[21] L. M. M. Cujilan, G. N. P. Acosta, and C. P. Y. Guacho, "Significant impact of intrapersonal intelligence on the learning of elementary school students," *LATAM Latin American Journal of Social Sciences and Humanities,* vol. 5, no. 5, pp. 4226–4240, 2024. https://doi.org/10.56712/latam.v5i5.2920

[22] S. Muhammadaly, O. Bash, and A. Kuralbaeva, "The importance of values education and its impact on character development," *Yassavi University Newspaper,* vol. 4, no. 134, pp. 412-422, 2024. https://doi.org/10.47526/2024-4/2664-0686.131

[23] I. Gonța, E.-D.-A. Vulpe, and H.-S. Ioniță, "Fostering values through education: psychological resources and strategies for a nonaggressive university environment," *Journal of Pedagogy,* vol. 72, no. 2, pp. 65–93, 2024. https://doi.org/10.26755/revped/2024.2/65

[24] M. Romzi, S. F. Noviyanti, T. Hamidah, and A. Fawaid, "Integration of islamic teachings in character education to strengthen morality and ethics in schools," *Maharot: Journal of Islamic Education,* vol. 8, no. 2, pp. 191-208, 2024. https://doi.org/10.28944/maharot.v8i2.1809

[25] I. Sofiani, N. Nabila, N. Neviani, and S. Syalini, "Islamic educational thought in building students' emotional intelligence," *International Journal of Innovative Research in Multidisciplinary Education,* vol. 3, no. 05, pp. 895-900, 2024. https://doi.org/10.58806/ijirme.2024.v3i5n26

[26] R. Fitria, A. Rosid, A. Syah, and M. S. Kurdi, "Dentification of best practices of higher education leadership in shaping student character following islamic guidance," *Jurnal Iqra': Kajian Ilmu Pendidikan,* vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 434-448, 2023. https://doi.org/10.25217/ji.v8i1.3928

[27] S. K. Thompson, *Sampling*. United States: John Wiley & Sons, 2012.

[28] World Medical Association, *Declaration of Helsinki: Ethical principles for medical research involving human subjects*. World Medical Association. https://www.wma.net/what-we-do/medical-ethics/declaration-of-helsinki/, 2013.

[29] G. M. Wagnild and H. M. Young, "Development and psychometric," *Journal of Nursing Measurement,* vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 165-17847, 1993.

[30] A. K. Mishra, "Ethics and value are essential: Role of higher education," *International Journal of Science and Research,* vol. 13, no. 3, pp. 400-404, 2024. https://doi.org/10.21275/sr24304150421

[31] E. G. Ngotho, "Ethical standards in higher education," *KIU Journal of Education,* vol. 3, no. 2, pp. 98 - 114, 2023. https://doi.org/10.59568/kjed-2023-3-2-11

[32] T. Giurgiuman and S. D. Vâtcă, "Ethics in the university environment: the student's perspective on the most important ethical standards," *Ethics and Deontology,* vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 79–87, 2023. https://doi.org/10.52744/red.2022.02.06

[33] S. A. Budiman, Z. H. Sain, and W. Kurniawan, "The role of religious extracurricular program activities in fostering religious moderation among students of public universities," *Tarbawi: Jurnal Keilmuan Manajemen Pendidikan,* vol. 10, no. 02, pp. 231-242, 2024. https://doi.org/10.32678/tarbawi.v10i02.9922

[34] Y. Suharyat, M. Resky, U. Khasanah, E. Malika, T. A. Putri, and M. F. Almaqsum, "The Influence of religious activities and social intelligence to form students' religious character," *Jurnal Ilmiah Ilmu Pendidikan,* vol. 6, no. 12, pp. 10972-10977, 2023. https://doi.org/10.54371/jiip.v6i12.3613

[35] P. S. Lakshmi, "The relevance of values education in today's higher education," *Journal of Research in Vocational Education,* vol. 6, no. 11, pp. 6–9, 2024. https://doi.org/10.53469/jrve.2024.6(11).02

[36] O. Brukhovetska, "Psychological features of the development of adolescent resilience," *Vìsnik Pìslâdiplomnoï Osvìti: Zbìrnik Naukovih Prac,* vol. 30, no. 59, pp. 47–64, 2024. https://doi.org/10.58442/3041-1858-2024-30(59)-47-64

[37] C. H. Rushton, *Conceptualizing moral resilience', in cynda hylton rushton (ed.), Moral Resilience: Transforming moral suffering in healthcare*, 2nd ed. New York: Oxford Academic, 2024.

[38] L. Pan *et al.*, "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,* vol. 24, no. 1, p. 823, 2024. https://doi.org/10.1186/s12888-024-06175-3

[39] G. Merzaq *et al.*, "Emotional intelligence and psychological resilience in education," *The Journal of Quality in Education,* vol. 14, no. 24, pp. 120-139, 2024. https://doi.org/10.37870/joqie.v14i24.449

[40] F. F. Abo Baraka, H. I. Ali, and S. M. A. Ebraheem, "Staff nurses' resilience: Its relation to moral intelligence and professional compatibility," *Deleted Journal,* vol. 15, no. 2, pp. 770-782, 2024. https://doi.org/10.21608/ejhc.2024.356780

[41] P. Galanis *et al.*, "Moral resilience reduces levels of quiet quitting, job burnout, and turnover intention among nurses: Evidence in the post COVID-19 era," *Nursing Reports,* vol. 14, no. 1, pp. 254-266, 2024. https://doi.org/10.20944/preprints202312.1216.v1

Appendix A.
S1. Moral Intelligence Scale

No.	Paragraph	Always	Sometimes	Somewhat	Rarely	Never
field of empathy						
1	I feel the pain of others, and I put myself in their place					
2	Show good listening, to those who complain to me of a problem					
3	I share with others their feelings and emotions whatever they are					
4	I avoid listening to the sorrows of others for any reason					
5	I understand the facial expressions of others even if they do not express them in words					
6	It's hard to understand what others are feeling					
7	I weaken my desire to understand the point of view of the other no matter what it is					
8	Show my sympathy for the other with my facial expressions and tone of voice					
9	I can pinpoint the feelings and feelings of others accurately					
10	I don't have enough time to share the pain of others.					
Field of conscience						
11	I imagine the results of my wrong actions before they happen					
12	I admit my mistakes and accept the advice and criticism of others					
13	I feel guilty when I oppress others					
14	I do whatever I like as long as no one knows about it					
15	I accept criticism of others no matter what					
16	I need someone to alert me to my right actions from my wrong actions					
17	Stay away from holding others accountable for their actions, no matter what they are					
18	I feel guilty when I spy or intrude on other people's privacy					
19	It's hard to understand how others feel					

No.	Paragraph					
20	I review my wrong behavior during my day before I go to sleep					
Autonomous field						
21	I make my decisions quickly, very impulsive					
22	I put all possible possibilities in front of me when I want to reach a decision					
23	I wait for my problems to be solved with time by leaving them without me trying to solve them					
24	I lose control of myself when I get angry					
25	I can postpone buying what I like until another time					
26	I act appropriately for the situation without anyone's help					
27	It's hard to control my emotions when I'm in a situation of abuse or frustration.					

S2: Continue

No.	Paragraph	Always	Sometimes	Somewhat	Rarely	Never
28	I get very angry when I am accused of a guilt I did not commit					
29	I respond to the same abuse when I am exposed to it					
30	My reactions are commensurate with the situations facing me					
Field of respect						
31	I apologize to everyone who made a mistake against him or bothered him					
32	I wait for whoever speaks to finish his words before I speak					
33	I listen to the opinions of those who are older than me without interrupting					
34	I avoid gossip and talking about others inappropriately					
35	I use other people's property and needs without their permission					
36	I laugh when I watch others being exposed to an embarrassing situation					
37	I talk about the privacy of others in a scandalous way no matter what it is					
38	I refrain from uttering insults or obscene gestures for any reason without anyone alerting me					
39	Make sure I speak in a decent voice when talking to others					
40	I deal politely with others regardless of their gender, beliefs or culture					
Tolerance						
41	I put all possible possibilities in front of me when I want to reach a decision					
42	I accept the right opinions of others, even if they differ from me in religion, gender, or socioeconomic status.					
43	I focus on choosing my friends on their good qualities more than on bad qualities					
44	I forgive those who apologize for offending me					
45	Judge others at first sight					
46	I sit as I want regardless of who sits with me					
47	I refuse to deal or listen to anyone who disagrees with me					
48	I find it difficult to listen and accept ideas that I don't know before					
49	I use polite phrases like (allow me) (please) without anyone alerting me					

No.	Paragraph					
50	I refrain from imposing my opinions on others and convincing them that they are wrong					
The field of justice						
51	I seek equality among my friends when I meet their needs					
52	.It saddens me that someone is treated unfairly					
53	I resent those who abandon justice in their judgment of others					
54	I take advantage of others when they need me					

S3: Continue

No.	Paragraph	Always	Sometimes	Somewhat	Rarely	Never
55	I consider listening to the abuser a waste of my time					
56	I listen to all parties to the problem before I make my judgment					
57	My judgments are made in favor of those with whom I have a special benefit or knowledge					
58	Take into account the rights of others no matter what they are					
59	I find it my right to keep the best thing when I am asked to distribute things with others					
60	I prefer to change the rules of the game to suit me					

Appendix B:
S1: Psychological Resilience Scale

No.	Paragraph	Always	Sometimes	Somewhat	Rarely	Never
Social Support						
1.	.I can't find anyone next to me in times of adversity					
2	I find at least one of my family who cares about me and complains to him about my concern					
3	There really are those in my life who feel my pain and sorrows					
4	I suffer from a lack of appreciation and interest from others					
5	I find someone to take care of me in times of need, whether inside or outside the family					
6	I lack confidence in any institution within the country that supports me during hardship					
7	When I am exposed to financial crises, I can't find anyone from my friends to help me					
8	In times of hardship I find someone to advise me and support me psychologically					
9	I don't have a close friend to complain to about my worries					
Personal competence area						
10	I prefer to solve my problems rather than avoid them					
11	My ability to control my emotions when faced with .problems is weak					
12	.I can't make the right decisions when facing problems					
13	I get an imbalance when I experience any change					
14	I have goals in mind that I strive to achieve					
15	When the pressures on me continue to increase, I .quickly collapse					
16	I always look forward to a better future with hope					
17	I am upset about my poor ability for academic achievement					
18	I can find creative solutions to my problems					
19	When I reflect on my thoughts and actions, I find .them unacceptable					

No.	Paragraph					
20	The system and rules make my life easier and better					
21	I feel I need more training on proper planning					
22	I fully believe in my abilities and I trust in myself					
23	I feel like an outside power bigger than me is controlling my destiny.					
24	When I collapse in the face of crises, I quickly regain my balance again.					
25	I can't manage my time well					
The field of social and family competence						
26	I can't form a new relationship with the other					
27	I am happier with others than with myself					
28	My social relationships with others end quickly and do not last					
29	My relationship with my family members is warm and harmonious					

S2: Continue

No.	Paragraph	Always	Sometimes	Somewhat	Rarely	Never
30	I find it hard to empathize and feel the feelings of others					
31	I prefer teamwork and cooperation with others to individual work					
32	I feel like I'm not loved by others.					
33	Others describe me as fun and light-hearted.					
34	I miss the spirit of communication and understanding with my family					
35	Flexibility in social situations is a feature of my personality					
36	I find it difficult to find a common language with others					
The field of value and religious structure						
37	Look at the bright side of things					
38	I can't deal with those who disagree with me in thought and behavior.					
39	I have full confidence and faith that God will stand by me.					
40	It's hard to find something or someone who satisfies me and I'm grateful to them.					
41	When crises accumulate on me, I feel that there is no point in solving them					
42	I have a purpose and a goal full of meaning to live for					
43	I feel like we are in a time when we can compromise on some of our values in order to live.					
44	I feel that my closeness to God and my religious commitment will help me face the pressures					
45	Commitment to the values of society has become something that is not required					