

Relationship among emotional intelligence, societal values, and sense of community among the gifted learners: A Saudi perspective

Mogbel Aid K Alenizi¹

ABSTRACT

The study's primary objective is to examine the differences between gifted/talented and typically developing students with regard to their emotional intelligence, understanding of social values, and sense of belonging to a group. The research sample was comprised of 119 gifted/talented students and 232 normal students who were selected using suitable sampling. In this research, I employed the Perceived Social Value Scale, the Sense of Community Scale, and the Revised Schutte Emotional Intelligence Scale. The study's participants also demonstrated more emotional intelligence, a stronger feeling of community, and a more nuanced understanding of social ideals than their typically developing counterparts. Emotional intelligence, a sense of community, and the perception of social values were all found to have positive connections in a sample of gifted and talented adolescents by means of a Pearson analysis. Differences in MANCOVA participants' feelings of belonging to a group and their valuations of its members' contributions could not be accounted for by their innate intelligence alone.

Keywords: *Emotional intelligence, social values, gifted learners, sense of community, special education*

About authors:

¹Northern Border University, Saudi Arabia

Introduction

Humans, by virtue of their emotions and cultural experiences, have always needed one another, and this dependence has evolved into a foundation for communal living. Having a desire to be part of something larger than yourself requires you to feel like you belong there (Glasser, 1986; Shaffer & Anundsen, 1993). The feedback people receive about their place in society reveals a feeling that goes beyond any other sentiment or emotion because the whole is greater than the sum of its parts. Those who are seeking meaning in life and can see the promise of humanity in themselves are the ones most likely to experience this emotion, which is known as a sense of community. A sense of community, put another way, is a feeling that protects social bonds and makes it worthwhile for people to share a dwelling (Alptekin, 2011; Hill, 1996; Rovai & Wighting, 2005). A sense of community, or belonging, is a feeling associated with the members of a group's concern for one another and the group. Creates group consciousness and commitment by convincing individuals that they are part of the only way their needs will be met (McMillan & Chavis, 1986; Hill, 1996; McMillan & Chavis, 1986). A community's sense of togetherness develops over time when its members share common beliefs and attitudes. When someone integrates into a group, they form emotional ties to the other people there and feel a responsibility to look out for their well-being. Sharing a space with others does not necessarily foster a sense of community (Chaskin, 2001; Wang, 2008).

According to Sarason (1974), building strong relationships with others is one strategy for overcoming loneliness. Involvement in school activities that promote a sense of community among students has been linked to lower rates of school dropout, higher levels of academic success, and fewer feelings of isolation (Rovai, 2002). Pretty (1990) argues that one's perception of a strong community is influenced by factors such as one's surroundings, one's interpersonal connections, and one's sense of social support. Examples of such values that appear to be linked to a strong sense of community include trust, social responsibility, initiative for community welfare, a sense of belonging, fairness, cooperation, loyalty, interaction, shared shares, and beliefs (Fisher et al., 2002; McMillan, 1996; McMillan & Chavis, 1986; Glynn, 1981; Torres-Harding, Diaz, Schamberger, & Carroll 2015; Rovai, 2000; Rovai & Wighting, 2005). Other values, some inherent to community and others emerging from it, are also necessary for people to live together and feel like they belong to a group or community. Most people would agree that a person's mental health and behaviour are both affected by and shape their core values. Because of this, values are fundamental to grasping how people act (Hofstede, 1980; KUSDIL & KAGATCIBASI, 2000). Values, according to the theories of Durkheim (1897/1964) and Weber (1905/1958), are crucial in understanding the formation and development of societies and individuals (Schwartz, 2012).

A person's values are the criteria by which they judge the merits of various entities (including themselves), objects, and events (Halstead & Taylor, 2000; Schwartz, 1992). Cultural values and beliefs shape and

are reflected in people's daily lives (Rokeach, 1973). Collectively, the principles that govern how people should act toward one another in order to achieve a common goal or goals, make decisions, and generate and implement new ideas are known as "social values" (Mumford & Gustafson, 1988; Kornblum, 1994). Social values are fundamental to any society and provide insight into the motivations behind individuals' thoughts and deeds, in addition to being an essential part of any culture. The language, emotions, and behaviours of an individual can be shaped by their upbringing. When trying to make sense of these numbers, it's crucial to take into account not only the external factors at play (Druskat & Wolff, 2001; Maboçolu, 2006), but also the impact of personal qualities like emotional intelligence. High emotional intelligence is characterised by the ability to perceive and manage one's own and other people's emotional states, as well as to use this knowledge to influence one's own and others' choices and actions (Brackett, Rivers, & Salovey, 2011). Emotional intelligence, according to Goleman (1995), is not a purely intellectual concept but rather a set of positive traits like self-awareness, self-assurance, honesty/conscientiousness, and drive for success.

In other words, he argued for a worldview that gives significance to how people employ and regulate their social and emotional selves to make sense of the world. Furthermore, he argued that talents just as crucial as academic intelligence (perhaps more so) was necessary for academic success and societal prosperity (Brackett & Geher, 2006; Al-Onizat, 2012). One's "emotional intelligence," or the capacity to make effective use of one's feelings, is thought to result from a healthy dialogue between the rational mind and the emotional self (Mayer, Salovey, & Caruso, 2001, 2004). Emotional intelligence is the ability to adapt in the classroom, maintain positive relationships, work through challenges, think critically, and make sound decisions (Azimifar, 2013; Keltner & Haidt, 2001; Lopes & Salovey, 2004). As this research shows, Emotional intelligence helps one build fulfilling relationships with others. Meaning that EQ allows for harmonious coexistence of feelings and interpersonal bonds (Ioannidou & Konstantikaki, 2008). A well-rounded and healthy emotional development includes the development of a strong moral compass and the formation of relationships with one's environment (Shelley, 2014). Low achievers may benefit from the ethical application of emotional and social intelligence, claim Lust and Moore (2006). According to Pizarro and Salovey (2002), empathy is one of the four components of emotional intelligence that is strongly linked to ethical principles. Intellectually gifted people often have difficulties in their interpersonal relationships and end up making bad choices (Goleman, 1995). To address this challenge, education must focus on developing students' minds and hearts simultaneously. The integration of two distinct brain

regions is reflected in a person's IQ and emotional development (Goleman, 2005). Academic achievement appears to have a positive relationship with emotional intelligence, as suggested by the available research (Parker et al., 2004; Rode et al., 2007; MacCann et al., 2003). People with high IQs and high emotional intelligence have a greater chance of developing into healthy adults who are able to resist the negative influences of their peers and maintain positive relationships with those outside their social circle (Mayer & Salovey, 1997).

Goleman (1995) argues that gifted children's high levels of emotional intelligence allow them to succeed in many different fields. Some scholars view giftedness negatively, seeing it as a set of challenges that can be experienced in emotional, behavioural, and social areas (Peyre et al., 2016; Sarçam & etinkaya, 2018); others view it positively, seeing it as an advantage for problem solving and a crucial factor for educational and professional success. Individuals who are gifted may face challenges when learning to get along with siblings of typical development (Daniels & Piechowski, 2009; Ourlu & Sarçam, 2018; Robinson, 2008). Gifted people who are also more emotionally vulnerable often withdraw from social situations in order to protect themselves from the ridicule, bullying, and insults they may experience at the hands of their peers (Davis, 2006; zbey & Sarçam, 2016; Reis et al., 1997). As a result, they may feel isolated and lose respect for established norms. Brilliant people often struggle with feelings of isolation, especially if they do not believe they are accepted by their peers. A person's EQ is a trait of personality that can be strengthened through training and study (Goleman & Cherniss, 2001; Weisinger, 1998).

However, today's schools place a disproportionate amount of emphasis on students' cognitive development and the transfer of skills essential to academic success; there doesn't appear to be a system in place to foster students' emotional intelligence (zbay & Palanc, 2011). The development of students' social and communication skills is not a focal point of this approach to education. There is no inherent tension between learning to think critically and developing one's capacity for self-awareness and empathy (Van der Zee et al., 2002). The study's goals include contrasting the emotional intelligence, perception of social values, and sense of community of gifted and typically developing students. The following hypotheses were tested in order to achieve this goal:

- a. Gifted students have a higher emotional intelligence than their typically developing peers.
- b. Gifted students report a stronger sense of community than their typically developing peers.

- c. Finally, gifted students have a more nuanced appreciation for the value of social norms than their typically developing peers.
- d. Fourth, talented students' assessments of social values and their capacity to form strong bonds with others are strongly correlated with their levels of emotional intelligence.
- e. In conclusion, gifted students have a more nuanced understanding of social norms and a stronger sense of community because of their elevated emotional intelligence.

2. Methodology

2.1. Participants

There were 351 high school and middle school kids in Rafha, Arar, and Hafar al Batin who took part; 119 (33.2%) were considered gifted, whereas 232 (66.8%) were considered typically-developing. The right sampling strategy was used to pick them. Students with an IQ of 130 or higher were identified as gifted and enrolled in specialised programmes at BILSEM centres for the arts and sciences. Common students were attending both public and private institutions of higher education. The pupils that took part had a mean age of 12.99 (SD = 1.31) and ranged in age from 12 to 17. There were 176 females and 174 males in the sample.

2.2. Study Instrument

Measure of Emotional Quotient via the Revised Schutte:

Based on the original work of Schutte et al. (1998), this scale was revised by Austin et al. (2004) to include 41 items and three dimensions. With this scale, you can express your level of agreement or disagreement on a Likert-style scale from 1-5. Specifically, Tatar et al. (2011) altered the scale for use in Turkish society (2011). After undergoing explanatory factor analysis (EFA), the total variance explanation ratio of this three-dimensional scale was determined to be 32.14 percent. The goodness of fit values obtained from the CFA were as follows: $\chi^2(347) = 2647.35$, $p < 0.001$, GFI=0.88, AGFI=0.86, PRATIO=0.92, RMSEA=0.06, and RMR=0.09. The correlation coefficients between the emotional intelligence scale and the five personality factors of extraversion, agreeableness/compatibility, psychoticism (self-control/responsibility), neuroticism (emotional inconsistency), and openness were .25, .28, .26, -.29, and .34, respectively, in the relevant criterion validity study examining empirical intelligence and the five-factor model of personality. For the full scale, the coefficient of internal consistency reliability (Cronbach's alpha) was .82. With respect to the overall scale score, the correlation coefficients for two applications separated by one week ($r = 0.49$) and two weeks ($r = 0.56$) were calculated, respectively ($p < 0.001$). The overall scale's Cronbach alpha for this

research came out to be .88, indicating high levels of internal consistency and dependability.

Scale for Assessing How Others See Your Commitment to Social Values

Bakaç (2013) created this scale to assess students' moral convictions. The scale has 23 items and 2 variables, and scores range from 5 (strongly agree) to 1 (strongly disagree) (strongly disagree). Inverting the scoring for the final four elements. KMO sampling adequacy was .81, and Bartlett's test of sphericity ($2(276) = 3.260$) was statistically significant at the $p < 0.05$ level. Two factors were identified using EFA, with the first accounting for 25.69 percent of the variance and the second for 10.33 percent. The overall Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient for the entire scale was .86. In this analysis, the Cronbach alpha internal consistency reliability coefficient was determined to be 0.78.

The Sense of Community scale

Developed by Chiessi et al. (2010), this scale consists of 20 items across a single dimension and is formatted as a 5-point Likert scale, with responses ranging from 0 (strongly disagree) to 4 (agree) (strongly agree). Turkish culture was absorbed by Akin et al (2013). The goodness of fit values obtained from the CFA are as follows: $\chi^2 = 637.53$, $df = 161$, RMSEA=.087, CFI=.91, IFI=.91, and SRMR=.076. Variables on the scale had factor loadings between .40 and .69. The test-retest reliability value achieved with a 3-week interval was .84, while the Cronbach's alpha internal consistency reliability coefficient of the scale was .87. Measure overall correlations after correcting for individual items ranged from .35 to .62. The overall Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient for this study came out to be .89, suggesting high levels of internal consistency.

2.3 Research procedure

These variables—giftedness, emotional intelligence, and the perception of social values—were handpicked for use in a causal comparison technique study to establish a connection. The primary variables were arrived at by combining the scales connected to the variables and the personal information form. A team of five professionals specializing in special education or related sub-areas approved the form, and the form was filled out in 35 minutes with the assistance of school counselors and administrators.

2.4 Analyzing the Data

Parametric tests were used to assess the data after it was imported into a computer system (kurtosis and skewness values fell within the range of -1.96 to +1.96). The analysis of the data included the use of the independent samples t test for binary comparisons, the Pearson product-moment correlation analysis for variable correlations, and the analysis of variance

(ANOVA) and multiple comparison tests (MANCOVA). The confidence interval was based on a significance level of $p < 0.05$. (CI).

3. Results

3.1. Comparative analysis

When comparing gifted and average pupils, the Kolmogorov-Smirnov statistics for emotional intelligence were 0.074 ($p > .05$) and 0.061 ($p > .05$),

respectively. Perceiving social values was shown to have a Kolmogorov-Smirnov statistic of 0.069 ($p > .05$) in high-achieving students and 0.058 ($p > .05$) in average students. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov statistics for students' feelings of belonging to a group were 0.079 ($p > .05$) and 0.056 ($p > .05$), respectively. As a result, the data is regularly distributed with respect to whether or not students are gifted. Table 1 displays the results of an independent samples t test that compared the scores of gifted and typical students on measures of emotional intelligence, perception of social values, and sense of community.

Table 1 Distribution of giftedness and average scores on tests of EI, PoSV, and SoC.

	Student	N	X	SD	t	p	d
EI	Gifted	119	158.3	23.1	2.1	.0	.24
	Normal	144	153.3	12.9			
PoSV	Gifted	119	100.1	12.9	3.1	.0	.33
	Normal	144	94.5	13.3			
SoC	Gifted	119	56.8	13.8	5.0	.0	.51
	Normal	144	49.1	12.8			

Table 1 shows that the average emotional intelligence score of gifted students ($X = 158.3$) was substantially higher than that of average students ($X = 153.3$) ($t = 2.1, p = .05$). Normal students scored 94.5 on the perception of social values, while exceptional students scored 100.1, a statistically significant difference ($t = 3.1, p = .01$). The effect sizes for these three factors were all around 0.2, therefore they were considered to be moderate. The effect sizes for these three factors were all in the moderate range, falling between 0.2 and 0.8. (Cohen, 1988).

3.2. Correlation results

Table 2 displays the findings of a Pearson moments correlation analysis that looked for a link between students' emotional intelligence, their assessment of social values, and their sense of community.

Table 2: A Pearson correlation visualising the connections between EI, PoSV and SoC

Variables	EI	PoSV	SoC	X	SD	Cronbah α
EI		.44	.31	152.5	17.34	.77
PoSV			.35	96.8	13.12	.74
SoC				51.2	13.9	.83

As can be shown in Table 2, at the .01 level of significance, there is a positive relationship between the scores on emotional intelligences, perception of social values, and sense of community. Furthermore, at the .01 level of significance, a positive correlation of $r = .31$ was found between the scores of perceptions of social values and sense of community. At the .01 level of significance, a partial correlation coefficient of $r_p = .31$ was discovered between the scores on measures of social value assessment and community belonging.

3.3 Causal Comparison findings

Is there a reason why brilliant students outperformed their average schoolmates on tests measuring their understanding of social ideals and their commitment to their community? Why do you think that is? Is it due to their innate talent or their capacity for empathy? In order to get to the bottom of things, we used multivariate analysis of covariance (MANCOVA). In order to do MANCOVA, it is necessary to make some assumptions that are quite similar to those used in ANCOVA and MANOVA. Having a normal distribution for the data is a prerequisite. The preceding argues in favour of this hypothesis. Second, all variance matrices for dependent variables should be identical and have similar covariance matrices. This assumption was tested using the Levene test and the Box M test, with the findings shown in Tables 3 and 4.

Table 3. Levene's Test of Equality of Error Variances

Dep. variables	F	df ₁	df ₂	p
PoSV	2.05	1	364	.09
SoC	.81	1	364	.31

Since the p values for both "perceived social values" and "feeling of community" in Table 3 are bigger than 0.05, we can infer that their respective variances are homogeneous with a 95% confidence interval.

Table 4. Box's Test of Equality of Covariance Matrices

Box's M	F	df ₁	df ₂	p
6.22	2.01	2.5	1445428.8	.052

Table 4 shows that there is no statistically significant difference [$F(2.01= 5.8, p=.100)$] between the variance and covariance of the independent variables giftedness and emotional intelligence covariate and the dependent variables perception of social values and sense of community across the different levels of the factors. Assuming a linear relationship between dependent variables is another one of MANCOVA's underlying premises. Table 2 shows that the correlation

coefficients between the variables are over 0.20 but below 0.60. Consequently, we may say that the final MANCOVA assumption has likewise been confirmed (Huberty & Olejnik, 2006). Table 5 shows the MANCOVA comparison results for the students' giftedness/normality and emotional intelligence, as well as their perceptions of social values and their sense of community as dependent variables.

Table 5. Results of Wilks' Lambda test about perception of social values and sense of community levels in the context of giftedness and normality and emotional intelligence.

	λ	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	P	η^2
Intercept	.84	23.2	2.00	362	.00	.11
Gift./Nor	.93	1.11	2.00	362	.27	.00
EI	.71	51.25	2.00	362	.00	.19
Gift./Nor EI	.93	2.03	2.00	362	.10	.01

Table 5 shows that there is no statistically significant difference in students' scores on perception of social values and sense of community based on giftedness when emotional intelligence is taken as a covariate (when controlled). In contrast, students' results on measures of their own emotional intelligence considerably diverged from one another ($F=52.9, p.05$). Additionally, there was a statistically significant difference in students' scores on perception of social

values and sense of community based on the interaction between giftedness and emotional intelligence ($F=1.9, p.05$). These findings suggest that students' scores on measures of their perception of social values and sense of community are not influenced by giftedness alone. Tables 6 and 7 display the findings of a multilinear regression analysis conducted to ascertain whether or not students' giftedness and emotional intelligence explained their impression of social values and sense of community

Table 6. Regression results for PoSV

Model	Unstand. Coefficients		Std. Coefficient β	t	p
	B	SH			
Const.	43.9	6.2		6.9	.0
Gift./Nor	-2.6	1.27	-.08	-2.05	.03
EI	.31	.03	.42	10.01	.0

Table 6 shows that the generalizable model is statistically significant ($F= 56.9, R^2=22, p0.01$) when it comes to explaining the variance in students' ratings

of the perception of social values. After running the numbers, we found that the model's effect size coefficient was $f^2=0.32$, which, using Cohen's criteria, indicates a modest effect (1988).

Table 7. Regression findings for SoC

Model	Unstand. Coefficients		Std. Coefficient β	t	p
	B	SH			
Const.	25.9	6.35		3.33	.0
Gift./Nor	-6.06	1.39	-.19	-4.2	.0
EI	.21	.33	.26	5.85	.0

As can be shown in Table 7, the model incorporating students' giftedness and emotional intelligence was found to be statistically significant ($F= 31.70$, $R^2=14$, $p < 0.01$). According to Cohen's criteria, the model's impact size is moderate, with a $f^2=0.16$ effect size coefficient (1988).

Kolmogorov-Smirnov test scores for emotional intelligence were 0.074 ($p > .05$) and 0.061 ($p > .05$) for gifted and typical students, respectively. The Kolmogorov-Smirnov values for gifted and normal students' ability to perceive social values were 0.069 ($p > .05$) and 0.058 ($p > .05$), respectively. Both gifted and average students had similar levels of community spirit, with Kolmogorov-Smirnov values of 0.079 ($p > .05$) and 0.056 ($p > .05$), respectively. This indicates that information on gifted students is distributed normally. Results of an independent samples t test comparing gifted and average kids' scores on measures of emotional intelligence, perceptions of social values, and emotions of belonging are shown in Table 1.

Table 1 shows that, on average, gifted students had an EQ that was 2 points higher than their average counterparts ($X = 159.30$ vs. $= 159.25$; $t = 2.15$, $p < .05$). The average Sense of Social Values score for gifted children was 100.54, significantly higher than the average score for normally developing children of 95.79 ($t=3.14$, $p < .01$). The average score of gifted children on the sense of community was significantly higher than that of normally developing children ($=57.24$; $t=3.14$, $p < .01$). All three of these covariates had moderate effect sizes, between 0.2 and 0.08. (Cohen, 1988).

4. Discussion

Study participants' emotional intelligence, perception of social values, and feelings of community were compared to those of typically developing students. The connection between EQ, the ability to appreciate others' perspectives, and a feeling of belonging was another target. It has been proposed that certain hypotheses can help us accomplish these aims.

The initial theory postulated that talented pupils would have a greater average emotional intelligence than their average counterparts. The results of the study indicated that talented students had a greater level of

emotional intelligence than their typically developing peers. There is a wealth of research in the literature corroborating the findings of this study (Al-Onizat, 2012; Ghani, 2016; Khasawneh & Aldiabat, 2017; Kaya et al., 2016; Parker et al., 2006; Schwean et al., 2006; Uyarolu, 2011). Academic ability and emotional intelligence were concepts that AlOnizat (2012) attempted to explain. He came to the conclusion that gifted children were effective in social situations because they had high levels of intellectual confidence and contentment. Gifted people are better able to grasp, control, and organise emotions and cases because of factors including rapid brain processes, creativity, and quick response based on them (Khasawneh & Aldiabat, 2017). Gifted people scored lower on the alexithymia scale and higher on the emotional intelligence scale. Emotional IQ is positively correlated with self-awareness and empathy and negatively correlated with the lack of both (known as alexithymia). It follows that gifted children have a deeper capacity for emotional intelligence and process management than their typically developing peers. However, others have not observed any substantial difference in emotional intelligence between talented and average pupils (Akca, 2010; zdemir, 2006; Sarçam, Adam Karduz, zbey, & elik, 2017; Shuler, 2004). It was hypothesized in the second theory that gifted kids would feel more connected to their school than their average counterparts.

The results of the study showed that talented adolescents had a stronger feeling of community than their typically developing peers. In their attempt to compare talented and typical pupils across EU member states, Godor and Szymanski (2017) looked at factors like compatibility, belonging, and student-teacher relationships. Pupils from 13 nations were polled, with gifted students scoring 91% higher than their typically-achieving peers. That is to say, compared to their typically developing country counterparts, gifted students are less likely to have feelings of social isolation and trouble finding friends at school. According to Manaster and Powell (1983), gifted kids' sense of belonging can be threatened if they feel excluded from any of the groups in the classroom. Godor and Szymanski (2017) claim that gifted children have the same or a greater sense of belonging than their typical peers, making them less likely to be marginalised in the classroom. Students feel more at home in school when it is tailored to their unique set of interests, skills, personalities, and values

(Duru & Balks, 2015; it stands to reason that gifted people who spend time with other gifted people feel a stronger sense of community.

The third hypothesis states that talented people will have a more acute awareness of social norms and expectations. The results showed that the sense of social values was much greater in brilliant people than in their average peers. Topçu (2015) argued that a person's representation in their social surroundings should reflect the principles of respect, tolerance, and being a good person, which are held to be especially important by brilliant students. According to research by Tirri et al. (2005), the moral growth and interest in ethical issues, particularly about war and terrorism, of gifted youngsters was significantly higher than that of their typically developing classmates. In their 2015 study, Cetinkaya and Kncal found that, compared to typically developing peers, gifted youngsters exhibited greater patience, respect for others' rights, wisdom, and liberalism. It was discovered by Tirri and Pehkonen (1998) that brilliant people have a stronger sense of fairness and accountability than their counterparts. They discovered, in particular, that talented students had heightened sensitivity to the pain of others and to adherence to the norms of scientific ethics. In light of these data, the third hypothesis is plausible.

An emotional intelligence, community orientation, and value perception triad were hypothesised to have a substantial statistical connection. The data collected lends credence to the theory. Findings suggest relatively favorable and significant correlations between them. Compared to their typically developing peers, gifted adolescents excel in areas such as social competence and socio-emotional adjustment, as evidenced by several empirical studies (Bain & Bell, 2004; Neihart, 1999; Nail & Evan, 1997). Neihart (1999) agrees that gifted children, in addition to developing their cognitive abilities, also develop their stress tolerance and social integration skills, which allows them to better understand themselves and others. Indicatives of a healthy body and mind include high levels of social skills and competence, an improved quality of life and relationships, and a sense of personal and professional accomplishment (Lehman & Erdwins, 1981). Indeed, a high level of empathy (particularly the ability to serve and aid others and be sympathetic towards them) among talented individuals is indicative of their sensitivity to and tight connection with their surroundings (Bakar et al., 2014). Those with exceptional intelligence who are also outstanding communicators and have strong community links are not likely to experience loneliness as a result of their talents. According to Ogurlu et al. (2016), gifted adolescents do not report higher rates of loneliness or worse levels of life satisfaction than their non-gifted counterparts. They have a similar age range, education level, and level of intelligence to their contemporaries,

which may account for this (Gross, 2002; Koç, 2015; Yeo, 2016). Gifted kids, according to Riley and White (2016), are open to interacting with peers who share their interests and perspectives both within and outside of the classroom. Both Luftig and Nichols (1991) and Ourlu and Sarcm (2018) found that gifted children were less likely to engage in aggressive conduct and were better able to form positive peer relationships. Based on this data, we can draw the conclusion that EQ aids in safeguarding people's inherent strengths and promotes their growth (Jahani Hashemi et al., 2008). It's reasonable to assume that gifted people's danger of feeling unaccepted by their peers will be lower due to their higher levels of emotional intelligence and skill. It has been found by Godor and Szymanski (2017) and Yeo (2016) that gifted people benefit from a strong sense of community and belonging. Gifted pupils with a stronger emotional intelligence and a sense of community will also find it simpler to assimilate into mainstream culture and adopt common values. When people feel a part of something larger than themselves, they are more likely to share common ideals (McMillan & Chavis, 1986). Gifted people often have a strong moral compass and are motivated by a desire to help others, which can make them inspirational figures to those around them (Ballam, 2013; Karataş & Saricam, 2016). Thus, it is reasonable to assume that talented people share the connection between EQ, connectedness, and social value assessment. The final hypothesis proposed that the exceptional empathy and understanding of social norms displayed by brilliant kids resulted from their superior emotional quotient. The findings from the study backed up the idea. Individuals with higher levels of emotional intelligence also report a marked improvement in their perception of shared values and their belief in the importance of contributing to their community. People that are gifted are often credited with having exceptional EQ. Therefore, compared to their counterparts, brilliant children have higher levels of prosocial traits like empathy (Hay et al., 2007). Because of their enhanced ability to understand and manage their own and others' emotional states and actions, people with gifts have an easier time achieving internal and external balance (Lee & Olszewski-Kubilius, 2006). Individual-environment adaptation has been proven to have a direct impact on pupils' feelings of belonging, as demonstrated by research by Duru and Balks (2015) and McMillan and Chavis (1986). Emotional acuity, in this light, is thought to be conducive to a stronger sense of belonging.

The ability to communicate in order to notice, interpret, and manage differences is all a component of cultural intelligence, which is a form of developable intelligence related to emotional intelligence (Mercan, 2016). Gifted people with high emotional intelligence are also predicted to have high cultural intelligence. According to Bijedic (2015), Kim and Van Dyne

(2011), and Tuan (2016), cultural intelligence improves global leadership; it also has a major effect on ethical principles and self-confidence; and Mercan (2016) claims that it boosts cross-cultural sensitivity.

Gifted people are more likely to internalise societal ideals because of the correlation between emotional intelligence and cultural intelligence. People are more likely to get along with one another if they have a strong sense of community and share similar views on social values. Because sharing ideals makes people feel more connected and fosters a feeling of belonging in the group. McMillan (2011) argued that human values and a feeling of belonging to a community should be evaluated in tandem. As a result, children will grow up in a social setting where the importance of the group and each member's role in that group is central to the processes that meet their needs for autonomy, competence, and belonging. Children acquire the social and ethical principles essential to a just, humane, and democratic society when they are immersed in an educational setting with these characteristics. It is in this context that the "moral socialisation" that Durkheim (1925/1961) has recommended actually occurs. That is to say, societal morality is built upon a foundation of family morality (Battistich, Solomon, & Watson, 1998). As a result, it's reasonable to conclude that having high emotional intelligence improves one's awareness of and appreciation for social values and their own place in the world.

To sum up, this and other research has shown that talented kids are more likely to outperform their counterparts in areas such as emotional intelligence, feeling of community, and the ability to perceive social values. In reality, it is their high emotional intelligence and the interplay between emotional intelligence and giftedness that accounts for their heightened feelings of community and appreciation for societal ideals. That is to say, there is a significant correlation between one's level of emotional intelligence and their assessment of social values and their degree of affiliation with a group. Consequently, a new method that classifies emotional intelligence scores in the same way as the classification of general intelligence scores (110-129 bright/superior intelligence, 130-145 superior-high intelligence) may be used in future studies to determine if emotional intelligence affects other variables.

Acknowledgement: The researcher gratefully acknowledges support received in the form of grant from the Deanship of Scientific Research (DSR), Northern Border University, Arar, KSA for the project "Relationship among emotional intelligence, societal values, and sense of community among the gifted learners: A Saudi perspective" (#8320-SAR-2019-1-10-F).

References

- Akca, F. (2010). Talented and average intelligent children's levels of using emotional intelligence. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 5, 553-558.
- Akın, A., Usta, F., & Eroğlu, N. Ç. (2013). Ergenlerde Topluluk Hissi Ölçeği Türkçe formunun geçerlik ve güvenilirliği [The reliability and validity of Turkish version of sense of community scale in adolescents]. *Mehmet Akif Ersoy Üniversitesi Eğitim Bilimleri Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 2(2), 16-25. Retrieved from <http://dergipark.gov.tr/download/article-file/207765>
- Al-Onizat, S. H. (2012). The relationship between emotional intelligence and academic adaptation among gifted and non-gifted student. *Journal of Human Sciences*, 9(1), 222-248.
- Alptekin, D. (2011). Toplumsal aidiyet ve gençlik: Üniversite gençliğinin aidiyeti üzerine sosyolojik bir araştırma [Social belonging and youth: A sociological study on university students? belonging]. Doctoral thesis. Selçuk University, Konya.
- Austin, E. J., Saklofske, D. H., Huang, S. H. S., & McKenney, D. (2004). Measurement of trait emotional intelligence: testing and cross-validating a modified version of Schutte et al.'s (1998) measure. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 36(3), 555-62. doi: 10.1016/S0191- 8869(03)00114-4
- Azimifar, M. (2013). The relationship between emotional intelligence and academic achievement among Iranian students in elementary schools. *European Online Journal of Natural and Social Sciences*, 2(2), 216-222. Retrieved from <http://european1science.com/eojnss/article/view/47>
- Bain, S. K., & Bell, S. M. (2004). Social self-concept, social attributions, and peer relationships in fourth, fifth, and sixth graders who are gifted compared to high achievers. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 48(3), 167-178. doi: 10.1177/001698620404800302
- Bakaç, E. (2013). Toplumsal Değerlere Yönelik Algı Ölçeği: Geçerlik ve güvenilirlik çalışması [Perception Scale of Social Values: Validity and reliability study]. *Eğitim ve Öğretim Araştırmaları Dergisi*, 2(4), 303-309. Retrieved from <http://www.jret.org/FileUpload/ks281142/File/33.bakac.pdf>
- Bakar, A. Y. A., Ishak, N. M., & Abidin, M. H. Z. (2014). The relationship between domains of empathy and leadership skills among gifted and talented students. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 116, 765-768. doi: 10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.01.294
- Ballam, N. (2013). 'Defying the odds': Gifted and talented young people from poor and minority

- backgrounds. Doctoral dissertation. University of Waikato, Tauranga, New Zealand.
- Banihashemian, K., Seyf, M. H., & Moazen, M. (2009). Relationship between Pessimism, General Health and Emotional Intelligence in College Students at Shiraz University and Shiraz University of Medical Sciences. *The Journal of Babol University of Medical Sciences*, 11(1), 49-56. Retrieved from <http://jbums.org/article-1-3151-en.html>
- Battistich, V., Solomon, D., & Watson, M. (1998). Sense of community as a mediating factor in promoting children's social and ethical development. Paper presented at the Annual Conference of The American Educational Research Association, San Diego, CA.
- Bess, K. D., Fisher, A. T., Sonn, C. C., & Bishop, B. J. (2002). Psychological sense of community: theory, research, and application. (pp.3-22). New York: Kluwer Academic. doi: 10.1007/978-1-4615-0719-2_1
- Brackett, M. A., Rivers, S. E., & Salovey, P. (2011). Emotional intelligence: Implications for personal, social, academic, and workplace success. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, 5(1), 88-103. doi: 10.1111/j.1751-9004.2010.00334.x
- Brackett, M. A., & Geher, G. (2006). Measuring emotional intelligence: Paradigmatic diversity and common ground. In J. Ciarrochi, J. P. Forgas & J. D. Mayer (Eds.), *Emotional intelligence in everyday life* (2nd ed.) (pp. 27-50). New York, NY: Psychology Press.
- Cetinkaya, C., & Kıncal, R. Y. (2015). Üstün zekâlı ve yetenekli çocukların demokrasi eğitimi. *Üstün Yetenekliler Eğitimi ve Araştırmaları Dergisi (UYAD)*, 3(1).
- Chan, D. W. (2008). Giftedness of Chinese students in Hong Kong: Perspectives from different conceptions of intelligences. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 52(1), 40-54. doi: 10.1177/0016986207311058
- Chaskin, R. J. (2001). Building community capacity a definitional framework and case studies from a comprehensive community initiative. *Urban affairs review*, 36(3), 291-323. doi: 10.1177/10780870122184876
- Chiessi, M., Cicognani, E., Sonn, C. (2010). Assessing sense of community on adolescents: Validating the brief scale of Sense Of Community in adolescents (SOC-A). *Journal of Community Psychology*, 38, 276-292. doi: 10.1002/jcop.20364
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd Ed.). NY: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
- Cooper, B. (2010). In search of profound empathy in learning relationships: Understanding the mathematics of moral learning environments. *Journal of Moral Education*, 39(1), 79-99. doi: 10.1080/03057240903528717
- Cutts, N. E., & Moseley, N., (2001). *Üstün zekâlı ve yetenekli çocukların eğitimi. [Education of gifted and talented children]* (Trans: İ. Ersevım). İstanbul: Özgür Yayınevi.
- Daniels, S., & Piechowski, M. M. (2009). *Living with intensity: Understanding the sensitivity, excitability, and emotional development of gifted children, adolescents, and adults*. Great Potential Press, Inc.
- Davis, G. A. (2006). *Gifted children, gifted education. A handbook for teachers and parents*. Great Potential Press, Inc.
- Druskat, V. U., & Wolff, S. B. (2001). Building the emotional intelligence of groups. *Harvard Business Review*, March, 80-90.
- Duru, E., & Balkıs, M. (2015). Birey-çevre uyumu, aidiyet duygusu, akademik doyum ve akademik başarı arasındaki ilişkilerin analizi. *Ege Eğitim Dergisi*, 16(1), 122-141. doi: 10.12984/eed.42566
- Fisher, A. T., Sonn, C. C., & Bishop, B. J. (Eds.). (2002). *Psychological sense of community: Research, applications, and implications*. Springer Science & Business Media.
- Fonseca, C. (2015). *Emotional intensity in gifted students: Helping kids cope with explosive feelings*. Sourcebooks, Inc.
- Ghani, W. Y. A. (2016). Emotional Intelligence among kindergarten gifted children, Irbid1Jordan. *International Journal of Education and Social Science*, 3(12), 17-28. Retrieved from <http://www.ijessnet.com/wp-content/uploads/2017/01/2.pdf>
- Glasser, W. (1986). *Control theory in the classroom*. Perennial Library/Harper & Row Publishers.
- Glynn, T. J. (1981). Psychological sense of community: Measurement and application. *Human Relations*, 34(9), 789-818. doi: 10.1177/001872678103400904
- Godor, B. P., & Szymanski, A. (2017). Sense of belonging or feeling marginalized? Using PISA 2012 to assess the state of academically gifted students

- within the EU. *High Ability Studies*, 1-17. doi: 10.1080/13598139.2017.1319343
- Goleman, D. P. (1995). *Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ for character, health and lifelong achievement*. Bantam Books.
- Goleman, D., & Cherniss, C. (2001). *The emotionally intelligent workplace: How to select for, measure, and improve emotional intelligence in individuals, groups, and organizations*. Jossey/Bass.
- Gross, M. U. M. (2002). Musings: Gifted children and the gift of friendship. *Understanding Our Gifted*, 14(3), 27-29.
- Halstead, J. M., & Taylor, M. J. (2000). Learning and teaching about values: A review of recent research. *Cambridge Journal of Education*, 30(2), 169-202. doi:10.1080/713657146
- Hay, P. K., Gross, M. U., Hoekman, K., & Rogers, K. B. (2007). Prosocial reasoning and empathy in gifted children. *Australasian Journal of Gifted Education*, 16(2), 5-14.
- Hill, J. L. (1996). Psychological sense of community: Suggestions for future research. *Journal of Community Psychology*, 24(4), 431-438. doi: 10.1002/(SICI)1520-6629(199610)24:43.0.CO;2-T
- Hofstede, G. (1980). Culture and organizations. *International Studies of Management & Organization*, 10(4), 15-41. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org/stable/40396875>
- Huberty, C. J., & Olejnik, S. (2006). *Applied MANOVA and discriminant analysis*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.
- Ioannidou, F., & Konstantikaki, V. (2008). Empathy and emotional intelligence: What is it really about?. *International Journal of Caring Sciences*, 1(3), 118-123.
- Karataş, Y., & Sarıcam, H. (2016). The relationship between moral maturity and sense and behaviors of responsibility in gifted children. *Global Journal of Psychology Research*, 6(1), 10-19. doi: 10.18844/gjpr.v6i1.491
- Lehman, E. B., & Erdwins, C. J. (1981). The social and emotional adjustment of young, intellectually-gifted children. *Gifted Child Quarterly*, 25(3), 134-137. doi: 10.1177/001698628102500311
- Lopes, P. N., & Salovey, P. (2004). Toward a broader education: Social, emotional and practical skills. In J.E. Zins, R. P. Weissberg & H. Walberg (Eds.), *Social and emotional learning and school success* (pp.76-93). New York: Teachers College Press.
- Luftig, R. L., & Nichols, M. L. (1991). An assessment of the social status and perceived personality and school traits of gifted students by non-gifted peers. *Roeper Review*, 13(3), 148-153. doi: 10.1080/02783199109553341
- Lust, E., & Moore, F. C. (2006). Emotional intelligence instruction in a pharmacy communications course. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 70(1), 06.
- Jahani Hashemi, H., Rahimzadeh Mirmahalleh, S., Ghafelehbashy, H., & Sarichloo, M. E. (2008). Investigating the mental health of the first-and last-year students of QUMS (2005). *The Journal of Qazvin University of Medical Sciences*, 12(2), 42-49. Retrieved from <http://journal.qums.ac.ir/article-1-384-en.html>
- Maboçoğlu, F. (2006). Duygusal zekâ ve duygusal zekânın gelişimine katkıda bulunan etkenler [Emotional intelligence and factors contributing to the development of emotional intelligence]. Master thesis. Ankara University, Ankara.
- Reis, S. M., Neu, T. W., & McGuire, J. M. (1997). Case studies of high-ability students with learning disabilities who have achieved. *Exceptional children*, 63(4), 463-479. doi: 10.1177/001440299706300403
- Riley, T., & White, V. (2016). Developing a sense of belonging through engagement with like-minded peers: a matter of equity. *New Zealand Journal of Educational Studies*, 51(2), 211-225. doi: 10.1007/s40841-016-0065-9
- Robinson, N. M. (2008). The social world of gifted children and youth. In S. I. Pfeiffer (Ed), *Handbook of giftedness in children* (pp 33-51). Springer, Boston, MA. doi: 10.1007/978-0-387-74401-8_3
- Rockstuhl, T., Seiler, S., Ang, S., Van Dyne, L., & Annen, H. (2011). Beyond general intelligence (IQ) and emotional intelligence (EQ): The role of cultural intelligence (CQ) on cross-border leadership effectiveness in a globalized world. *Journal of Social Issues*, 67(4), 825-840. doi: 10.1111/j.1540-4560.2011.01730.x
- Rode, J. C., Mooney, C. H., Arthaud-Day, M. L., Near, J. P., Baldwin, T. T., Rubin, R. S., & Bommer, W. H. (2007). Emotional intelligence and individual performance: Evidence of direct and moderated effects. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 28(4), 399-421. doi: 10.1002/job.429

- Rovai, A. P. (2000). Building and sustaining community in asynchronous learning networks. *The Internet and higher education*, 3(4), 285-297. doi: 10.1016/S1096-7516(01)00037-9
- Rovai, A. P. (2002). Sense of community, perceived cognitive learning, and persistence in asynchronous learning networks. *The Internet and Higher Education*, 5(4), 319-332. doi: 10.1016/S1096-7516(02)00130-6
- Rovai, A. P., & Wighting, M. J. (2005). Feelings of alienation and community among higher education students in a virtual classroom. *The Internet and higher education*, 8(2), 97-110. doi: 10.1016/j.iheduc.2005.03.001
- Rokeach, M. (1973). The nature of human values. Free press. 91.
- Salovey, P., & Mayer, J. D. (1990). *Emotional intelligence. Imagination, Cognition and Personality*, 9(3), 185-211. doi: 10.2190/DUGG-P24E-52WK-6CDG
- Sarason, S. B. (1974). *The psychological sense of community: Prospects for a community psychology*. Jossey-Bass.
- Sarıçam, H., & Çetinkaya, Ç. (2018). Exploring revenge as a mediator between bullying and victimisation in gifted and talented students. *Current Issues in Personality Psychology*, 6(2), 102-111. doi: 10.5114/cipp.2018.72267
- Sarıçam, H., Adam Karduz, F. F., Özbey, A., & Çelik, Z. (2017). Üstün zekâlı/yetenekli öğrenciler ile normal gelişim gösteren öğrencilerin duygusal zekâ düzeylerinin karşılaştırılması [The comparison of emotional intelligence levels between gifted/talented students and average students]. *Siirt Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 5(2), 461-485. Retrieved from <http://dergipark.gov.tr/download/article-file/391823>
- Schutte, N. S., Malouff, J. M., Hall, L. E., Haggerty, D. J., Cooper, J. T, Golden, C. J., &
- Dornheim, L. (1998). Development and validation of a measure of emotional intelligence. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 25(2), 167-77. doi: 10.1016/S0191-8869(98)00001-4
- Schwartz, S. H. (1992). Universals in the content and structure of values: Theoretical advances and empirical tests in 20 countries. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 25, 1-65. doi: 10.1016/S0065-2601(08)60281-6
- Schwartz, S. H. (2012). An overview of the Schwartz theory of basic values. *Online readings in Psychology and Culture*, 2(1), 11. doi: 10.9707/2307-0919.1116
- Schwean, V. L., Saklofske, D., Widdifield-Konkin, L., Parker, J. D., & Kloosterman, P. (2006). Emotional intelligence and gifted children. *Sensoria: A Journal of Mind, Brain & Culture*, 2(2), 30-37.
- Shaffer, C., & Anundsen, K. (1993). *Creating community anywhere*. New York: Jeremy P. Tarcher.
- Shelley, L. U. (2014). *A study to assess emotional intelligence and moral values in adolescents with unsatisfactory academic performance*. Doctoral Dissertation. Vinayaka Missions University.