

Predictive Ability Of Moral Intelligence In Academic Entitlement Among University Students

Omar Al-Adamat^{1*}, Tmara Husban², Hussein Tarawneh³, Nabil S.Hemedan⁴, Mo'en Salman Alnasraween⁵, Rami Ibrahim Shogran⁶

^{1*} Department of Psychological and Educational Counseling, College of Educational and Psychological sciences, Amman Arab University, Jordan h.tarawneh@aau.edu.jo

²Ministry of Education, Jordan. Orcid No: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9767-5754>. Email: adamat88@gmail.com.

³Ministry of Education, Jordan. Orcid No: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3366-1193>. Email: Thusbaan22@gmail.com.

Orcid No <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5770-4955>

⁴Department of Psychological and Educational Counseling, College of Educational and Psychological sciences, Amman Arab University, Jordan, Email: Nabil.h@aau.edu.jo, Orcid No <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3441-7539>

⁵Associate Professor of Measurement, and Evaluation, Amman Arab university, ORCID :<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1905-6253>, Amman Arab University – Jordan, mueen@aau.edu.jo.

⁶ Department of educational administration, Amman arab <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3182-5043>, ramishogran@aau.edu.jo.

***Corresponding Author:** Omar Al-Adamat

^{*}Ministry of Education, Jordan. Orcid No: <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9767-5754>. Email: adamat88@gmail.com.

Citation: Omar Al-Adamat, et al (2024), Predictive Ability Of Moral Intelligence In Academic Entitlement Among University Students, Educational Administration: Theory and Practice, 30(5), 3295-3309

Doi: 10.53555/kuey.v30i5.3440

ARTICLE INFO

ABSTRACT

This study aimed to investigate the predictive ability of moral intelligence in academic entitlement in Al al-Bayt University students and to determine its level among them. It also sought to determine whether differences in academic entitlement are attributable to gender, type of college, and academic level. Two measures were utilised to achieve the study objectives. A total of (404) male and female students were recruited for this study using the convenience sample method. The level of moral intelligence and academic entitlement was found to be high. The findings showed statistically significant differences in the level of academic entitlement attributed to the gender variable (females) and statistically significant differences in academic entitlement in the college variable (scientific colleges). However, no statistically significant differences were observed in the level of academic entitlement due to the academic level variable. Moral intelligence contributed to explaining (47.1%) of the variance in academic entitlement.

Keywords: Moral intelligence, Academic entitlement, Al al-Bayt University students

Introduction:

Morality is one of the cornerstones of creating a healthy, stable society devoid of behavioural problems. Education institutions play a significant part in shaping students' conduct and helping them develop their distinctive personality traits to establish a moral value system that upholds society's values and lessens the likelihood of behavioural problems. Moral or value inconsistencies within these institutions lead to the emergence of psychological, behavioural, and academic performance problems among students. Their actions in various scenarios and how they interact with others around them are indicators of their moral ideals and values.

Moral intelligence is regarded as a key indicator for interpreting and managing students' conduct and leading them to act in ways consistent with society's norms and regulations (Borba, 2003; Clarken, 2010; Al-Obaidi & Al-Ansari, 2016). According to Barque-Duran et al. (2016), university students deal with various moral dilemmas that require them to apply their morals and self-values. As a result, they adopt a particular moral behaviour that aids in resolving the moral dilemmas they face daily. In this regard, the literature in the education field indicated that moral intelligence is one of the components of the theory of multiple intelligences developed by the scientist Gardner, who suggested that intelligence is not limited to one aspect of mental and

emotional abilities but includes multiple components in varying proportions for the student. He added that the student resorts to these abilities when confronted with different situations.

Moral intelligence is also linked to components that intersect with the theory of multiple intelligences. Moral intelligence is the student's ability to realise his feelings and self-recognition, in addition to his understanding and knowledge of the feelings and motives of others and his ability to use the cognitive structures that he possesses in organising and directing his behaviour when interacting with those situations (Abu Awad, 2011; Whitaker & Greenleaf, 2017). In the same context, (Kaliská, 2014) confirms that moral intelligence is not limited to the student's ability to think ethically but also includes his ability to adopt moral behaviours, beliefs, and values.

Though numerous researchers have debated the notion of moral intelligence, Michelle Borba stands out as one of the best to have offered a systematic explanation of its nature. According to Michelle Borba (Borba, 2001), moral intelligence refers to a student's capacity to recognise right from wrong and distinguish between them. And that the student has moral convictions that enable him to act morally in a variety of circumstances thanks to his possession of seven moral qualities or virtues that serve as his moral foundation, protect his value system, help shape his personality, keep him away from vices, and guide his behaviour. These virtues are Empathy, which means that the student has a high level of emotional sensitivity that enables him to understand others' feelings and thus helps him to respond to them appropriately. Consciousness is represented in the student's possession of a set of higher values rooted in his cognitive structure, which he acquired through previous cognitive and emotional experiences and his social interactions, which helps him direct his behaviour in a socially acceptable manner. Self-control expresses the student's ability to control his behaviour and thoughts and adapt them to help him perform socially acceptable behaviour and avoid unacceptable behaviour. Respect refers to the student's self-respect, respect for others and their abilities, and not underestimating himself or others (Alnasraween et al., 2022).

Kindness is the student's ability to assist needy people without asking. Tolerance refers to the mental openness that the student has towards the beliefs of others, regardless of their religious beliefs, colour, and race. Finally, Fairness refers to the student's knowledge of his rights and the rights of others and dealing with those rights based on equality and justice for all since they hold the same rights and duties. According to Hajjar (2018), these attributes and components are present in all students, but they do so in varied degrees depending on their interactions with their environment, society, and others. Contrarily, (Abu Jado & Nofal, 2007) contend that differences in moral intelligence's constituent parts may mainly result from the student's source of moral ideals. This source may have a direct impact, such as the family, school, and places of worship, or an indirect impact, such as from social networking sites or his peers.

However, it should be emphasised that there are several models for how moral intelligence functions. Whereas the Piaget and Kohlberg theory emphasises the psychological factors underpinning the student's issuing of moral judgements in the situations he meets, the cognitive-developmental model of moral intelligence emphasises the student's moral methods of thinking. Like that proposed by Bandura and Korthi, the behavioural model focuses on how students learn moral conduct and reasoning via observation, imitation, reinforcement, and conditioning. The third model that describes moral intelligence is the emotional model, based on Freud and Gilligan's theory and relates to the student's integration into societal standards of conduct and the associated morality-related feelings, such as sorrow and regret (AlMalki, 2019).

Abu Awad (2011) states moral intelligence has three main components. The cognitive component is represented by the student's level and type of situational perception and understanding through information processing and the formation of concepts he adopts as a motivator and driver of his behaviour. The behavioural component refers to the character of the student's social behaviours and the behavioural ramifications they bear, which indicate the moral principles he upholds. The emotional side, which manifests through having a high degree of moral commitment in thinking and conduct, displays the underlying impulses that guide behaviour.

Moral intelligence is related to ethical behaviour. It is also related to the moral competence that the student possesses, which enables him to present moral principles over personal self-goals, which drives him to act in a socially and ethically acceptable manner. However, his lack of moral intelligence causes him to lose control and his capacity for self-regulation, which exposes him to a wide range of psychological and behavioural disorders that have an impact on many facets of his personality (Coles, 2017; Bozaci, 2014; Alhadabi et al., 2019). The researchers see that academic entitlement can be affected by different psychological and educational variables, including the level of moral intelligence.

Academic entitlement is a significant issue because of the detrimental behaviours these students exhibit in the classroom, such as acting bored or angry or inappropriately objecting to grades, and putting little effort into their studies because they feel they are entitled to success despite their weak performance (Reysen et al., 2017; Khojasteh & Keener, 2018). As a result, academic entitlement is a problem that hinders the educational process from moving forward and can lead to moral, intellectual, and psychological pressures. Numerous issues can impact the higher education system and its constituent parts. These issues could be connected to academic performance, procrastination, accomplishment, and entitlement. It is connected to behaviours like violence, academic bullying, disobedience of university rules, and disobedience of moral norms and principles, among others (McLellan, 2019).

The concept of academic entitlement was first coined by Morow in 1994 in his article (Racial Learning), in which he discussed the collapse of the educational system. He attributed this dramatic change to the widespread culture among university students about the educational process. He claimed that students prioritise success and attain higher grades over knowledge acquisition, regardless of whether the learning process goals have been achieved. They also attribute their failure to external factors such as the teacher, the curriculum and the educational system without considering their failure to exert the required effort to achieve the required level of success (Peirone & Maticka-Tyndale, 2017).

Several studies have demonstrated the relationship between entitlement and narcissism and suggested that entitlement is a stable personality trait that varies over time and across domains. According to Kopp and Finney (2013), entitlement is a factor in the dimensions of narcissistic personality. Menon and Sharland (2011) confirms the existence of a positive correlation between narcissism and academic entitlement, where the feeling of entitlement develops in early life stages as a result of the unjustified and exaggerated reinforcement that the individual initially receives from their parents in exchange for the minimal effort they exert, which continues with them throughout all stages of life (Boswell, 2012).

Several studies have investigated entitlement in the university environment. Chowning and Campbell (2009) claimed that entitlement most affects university students. (Kurtyilmaz, 2019) believes that academic entitlement among university students may lead to students engaging in unethical and unacceptable behaviours such as aggression, disrespect, intolerance, and cheating. In the same context, (Campbell et al., 2004) added that academic entitlement among university students leads to negative effects that appear in the form of negative behaviours such as aggression, difficulty in adapting, difficulty in forming social relationships, conflicts with oneself and with others, selfishness, and the inability to control oneself.

In university settings, academic entitlement may take various forms where students can demonstrate their academic entitlement via their actions, attitudes, and viewpoints. For instance, the student may beg the instructor to boost his test score or believe that because of his tuition, he will get specific services (McLellan & Jackson, 2017). Students' belief in academic entitlements has several effects on higher education and the relationships between students and their professors, students with each other, and students and administration. Where students engage in unacceptable behaviours towards others and severely criticise them in the classroom, which impedes lecturers' ability to teach effectively, and thus fails the learning process. These behaviours may be associated with rude conduct in the classroom or what is called annoying behaviour, including: falling asleep during lectures, side conversations with others, leaving the room without permission, showing boredom, anger, inappropriate use of technology in a way that hinders the learning process, and annoying lecturers purposefully (Chowning & Campbell, 2009).

Numerous personal factors, such as narcissism, the cost students paid for their education, and universities' reliance on tuition fees as revenue sources, were related to students' sense of academic entitlement. These factors made students feel like customers purchasing a service and gave them the impression that they were in charge and authority in academic settings. In addition, students have unrealistic ideas that effort and participation are the minimum criteria for success. We cannot ignore that social media encourages students' sense of entitlement by seeking attention and self-promotion. We see that narcissistic personality characteristics are directly related to the time students spend on social media and the comments they receive, including expressions of praise and encouragement, resulting in their belief that they always deserve the best. On the other hand, students' participation in various human development programs reinforced their sense of entitlement. Most of these courses are held online, receiving certificates without trying to attend and actively participate (Greenberger et al., 2008; Chawning & Campbell, 2009). As a result, they develop beliefs based on those earlier life experiences that they deserve the best.

For many researchers, discovering gender differences in any psychological phenomenon raises questions. The findings of earlier research, including those by Sohr and Turnipseed and Cohen (2015), Boswell (2012), Cani et al. (2012), and Elias (2017), demonstrated gender differences in academic entitlements. Males have a greater degree than females in the attitudes and practices of academic entitlements, which is explained by the fact that the studies related to entitlements that the researchers had access to all have single-track results.

Academic entitlements have been defined as the student's expectations of achieving academic success without assuming personal responsibility and not performing the required effort (Peirone & Maticka-Tyndale, 2017). Jordan et al. (2017) defines it as the student's cognitive and psychological beliefs about himself that he deserves the best academic results regardless of the level of effort exerted in comparison with his peers. Heffernan and Gates (2018) sees it as students' beliefs and attitudes about their entitlement to academic success regardless of their effort. Some researchers described academic entitlement as the student's beliefs about his entitlement to obtain positive academic results, such as high grades, regardless of his level of performance and effort, and his belief that he is the best among his peers.

The aforementioned leads us to conclude that the student's sense of entitlement results from his belief that his academic success and distinction from others are due to his internal self-characteristics. As a result, he feels he is entitled to good results and special treatment, different from his peers. According to (McLellan, 2019; Boswell, 2012), academic entitlement may be a defensive tactic students with poor academic performance use to safeguard their self-esteem. Blaming others rather than themselves confirms that their control point is external, which governs their behaviour and thinking. Accordingly, the researchers believe that academic

entitlement is a coping strategy that students use after low academic performance to protect their self-esteem, as they redirect blame to others instead of themselves, and this indicates that they have an external point of control that controls their behaviour.

Academic entitlement is made up of several elements that can be broken down into two categories: a sense of entitlement, which is the student's propensity to receive rewards and incentives independent of his performance and effort; beliefs, which are reflected in minimising individual accountability for academic success, and unrealistic expectations regarding the role of teachers and institutions in the event of academic failure. The second component is entitled behaviours: aggressive conduct toward others, resentment of failure or poor grades, and scientific dishonesty (Jackson et al., 2011).

The prior educational and psychological literature on the topic showed that several instruments were used to measure academic entitlement. There are one-dimensional scales whose items reflect the student's beliefs about himself that he deserves the best and better compared to others, such as (Greenberger et al., 2008; Kopp, 2013). The two-dimensional scale includes (Achacoso, 2002), whose scale is represented by two dimensions: the beliefs of entitlement, and actions of entitlement, in addition to the Chowning and Campbell (2009) scale, which also measures two dimensions, which are Externalized Responsibility and Entitled Expectations, and the Aldabue (2020) scale measures two dimensions: beliefs of academic entitlement and behaviours of academic entitlement. In the same context, Jackson et al. (2020) assert that academic entitlement includes three components: the deserved attitude towards obtaining rewards that have nothing to do with student performance, reducing personal responsibility for academic success, and unrealistic expectations for the role of teachers and educational institutions.

However, it must be emphasised the importance of distinguishing between two dimensions of academic entitlement: Exploitative entitlement, which refers to the belief that the student deserves more than others, and therefore is associated with low self-esteem, irresponsibility, manipulation, cruelty, and neuroticism. Non-exploitative refers to the belief that students deserve positive outcomes without exploiting others. Higher levels of non-exploitative benefits are positively associated with higher levels of self-esteem and positive work attitudes; This suggests that some forms of entitlement may be related to levels of achievement (Lessard et al., 2011).

Jackson et al. (2020) divide the dimensions of academic entitlement into six dimensions: Reward for effort, which refers to getting a high score for studying, even if the performance is bad or if the participation or attendance of the lecture takes place, the student gets a high score. Accommodation: teachers break the rules for the sake of the student, blame the professor if the student performs poorly, change the date of exams if the student is not ready, and do not think about the difficulty of learning course topics. Responsibility Avoidance involves abdicating one responsibility and duties to others, lying to the professor to avoid failing to complete a task, and receiving the same grade as peers despite their effort. Customer Orientation: The student knows how he is taught, how to choose his test and the courses required for graduation. Customer Service Expectations: The professor's willing to meet the student at the appropriate time for the student, respond to students' messages, accept their contact with him when they need assistance, and make his phone number available to the student. And Grade Hagglng: Arguing or complaining to officials to obtain a higher grade.

According to Kopp et al. (2011), academic entitlement is linked to various ideas, including the notion that learners should be allowed to learn but that the instructor should make learning easy and knowledge-gathering effortless. The second theory contends that learning issues are not caused by personal shortcomings on the part of the student but rather by shortcomings in the instructor, the course material, or the educational system as a whole. The opposite idea is that students are in charge of creating the plans and rules that the instructor must follow during lectures and that they have the right to succeed because they paid for their education.

Students with high academic excellence are distinguished by a high orientation towards attaining good marks and a low orientation towards learning. The findings of a study (Goldman & Martin, 2014) that indicated that academic entitlement is favourably linked with degree orientation and adversely associated with self-efficacy provide weight to this. High academic achievers also tend to disappoint when much work is necessary quickly. Because of this, they often put off completing their academic assignments, which can result in worse results. Additionally, these students' high intolerance and frustration make it difficult to deal with academic obstacles that require unanticipated effort (McLellan & Jackson, 2017).

In addition to the traits above, students with high academic entitlement are known for having an extrinsic point of control, believing that outside forces influence their behaviour. They are also known for having high external motivation, narcissism, and a propensity to take advantage of others (Turnipseed & Cohen, 2015). This is in line with what was stated by (Reysen et al., 2017), who noted that academic entitlement is directly related to students' behaviours that do not promote effective learning in the classroom. These behaviours include sleeping in class, having side conversations with other students, leaving the room without permission, using the phone, displaying boredom or anger, and using technology inappropriately.

Previous Studies

Abdellatif (2022) conducted a study to identify the correlations between moral intelligence and both academic entitlement and academic performance; in addition to identify the mediating role of academic entitlement between moral intelligence and academic performance. Four hundred and forty-four students from (Yemen,

Egypt, Saudi Arabia, Iraq, and Jordan) participated in the research. The results revealed that there was a statistically significant negative correlation between moral intelligence and academic entitlement and a significant positive correlation between moral intelligence and academic performance. Results demonstrated the mediating role of academic entitlement between moral intelligence and academic performance.

Reysen et al.(2020) aimed to explore the relationship among academic entitlement, life satisfaction, and academic performance as measured by cumulative grade point average. When comparing academically at-risk versus non-at-risk college students, academically at-risk students scored significantly lower on satisfaction with life than their non-at-risk peers. In addition, a significant negative correlation was found between academic entitlement and satisfaction with life for all students. Implications and suggestions for future research are discussed.

Aras (2022) aimed in his study to identify the relationship between the moral intelligence of academic leaders and moral leadership behaviors. The study sample consisted of academics working in a public university who have a set of administrative duties, and they are (Dean, Deputy Dean, Department Head, Director of the Research and Application Center (Assistant Director of the Research and Application Center, Director of the Vocational School), the researcher in this study used the descriptive survey method, and collected study data using the random sample method and using the three-dimensional moral intelligence scale and the four-dimensional moral leadership scale expressions. The results of the study showed that empathy, self-control, and kindness are Effective dimensions in moral leadership behavior. It also showed a strong relationship between moral intelligence and leadership behavior with its sub-dimensions.

Anggraeni & Aziz (2022) conducted a study that aimed to identify the impact of transformational leadership and infrastructure on employee performance, in addition to highlighting the importance of good leadership and adequate resources having an impact on effective job performance. A quantitative descriptive approach and a simple random sample were used on employees and leaders. Employees in the Public Prosecutor's Office in the city of Cirebon. The results of the study showed that the performance of employees was affected by the leadership style used by (54.2%), while the performance of employees was affected by the infrastructure by (45.8%), in addition to that transformational leadership and infrastructure have a positive impact on the employee's performance in the office. Cirebon City Prosecutor. The study recommended working to improve the quality of public services provided because of its impact on improving employee performance.

Fadhil et al.(2021) also conducted a study aimed at revealing the impact of moral intelligence in enhancing strategic leadership in productive organizations. The study used the descriptive analytical approach and purposive sampling, and a sample of (119) leaders working in the administrative and production sectors was selected. And technical, and distributed a questionnaire for moral intelligence that measures (integrity, tolerance, responsibility, and compassion) and a questionnaire for strategic leadership that measures (focus on work, operational efficiency, business development, and organizational innovation). The study concluded that the moral intelligence of the leader effectively affects the strengthening of strategic leadership, Moral intelligence also has an effective role in improving the relationship between strategic leaders and employees, in addition to having a moral impact on the dimensions of the leader's moral intelligence and enhancing strategic leadership.

As conducted by Noor et al. Al. 2021) a study that aimed to identify the factors affecting the level of job performance of teachers in schools. The study used a qualitative approach and an interview tool. A sample of (6) teachers was selected from (3) high-performing schools in the state of Kedah. The results of the study showed that the level of job performance It has an impact on four main axes, namely (the teacher's attitude, skills, self-emergent knowledge, and developing self-efficacy), and that the school climate factor affects teachers as an external factor, and the level of teachers' job competence is affected by the conditions of the work environment. The study recommended increasing teachers' job competence, and providing teachers Methods of planning lessons and purposeful teaching strategies, and enabling teachers to use thinking and technical skills.

Paudel (2021) aimed to identify the level of academic performance of faculty members in higher education institutions. The quantitative approach was used and tools were developed to measure the academic performance of faculty members using the Delphi method. The study sample consisted of (445) faculty members in (4) Universities, and one of its most important results was that there is a high level of academic performance among faculty members in higher education institutions in Nepal, and that the academic performance of faculty members is concerned with improved practices of academic activities and discourses, in addition to the presence of statistically significant differences between the organizational environment, culture, and infrastructure. Technology and the level of academic performance in academic circles. The study recommended that higher education institutions show more interest in the main processes and activities that stimulate the academic environment.

Moral intelligence levels varied, as shown by some studies. In (Moghadas & Khaleghi, 2013; Guiab et al., 2015; Al-Adamat & Alwan, 2019; AlSmadi & AlZghoul, 2019) came with an average level. In contrast, it was high in the studies (Abu Roumi & Al-Khalidi, 2017; Al-Momani, 2015). Many previous studies also indicated different levels of academic entitlement. The study (Aldabue, 2020; Sohr-Preston & Boswell, 2015) indicated high academic entitlement. Ellis et al. (2021) study indicated low academic entitlement.

Previous studies showed differences in the level of academic entitlement attributable to gender, college, and year of study. In (Pilott et al., 2021), no statistically significant differences in academic entitlement were found due to the gender variable. In (Aldabue, 2020), statistically significant differences were observed in academic entitlement due to gender (men), academic specialisation (humanities), and studying year (the first). However, the study (Seipel & Brooks, 2020) indicated no statistically significant differences in students' perceptions of academic entitlement due to the variables of specialisation and gender. The studies (Elias, 2017; Sohr-Preston & Boswell, 2015) reported differences in academic entitlement, where men outperformed women. In (Ciani et al., 2008), gender differences were found favouring men, but no statistically significant differences were observed for the impact of a year of study.

Much research has linked moral intelligence to academic entitlement and academic performance as they revealed that the higher the degree of entitlement, the higher the degree of academic dishonesty (Greenberger et al., 2008). Bonaccio et al. (2016) found a negative relationship between entitlement and positive personality traits: such as agreeableness, conscientiousness, extraversion, honesty, humility, agreeableness, conscientiousness, and openness. Goodboy and Frisby (2014) concluded that students with high academic entitlement engage in negative, undesirable behaviours and are highly critical of others.

Kurtylmaz (2019) reported that entitlement promotes undesirable behaviours among students in academic situations, such as anger, disrespect, and aggression. Elias (2017) found a positive correlation between academic entitlement and exam cheating. The study (Fromuth, 2019) revealed a negative correlation between academic entitlement and motivation for learning. According to what has been said, academic success is often the result of immoral behaviours that negatively affect students' personal qualities like honesty, conscience, and responsibility. Additionally, it affects how students behave and how well they accomplish in school. Moral intelligence is one of the variables of positive psychology that are important in reducing negative behaviours. And previous studies reported this. Hence, This current study aimed to reveal the predictive ability of moral intelligence in academic entitlement among university students.

Comments on previous studies

Studying the predictive ability of moral intelligence in academic merit among university students represents an important topic that sheds light on the relationship of moral factors to academic performance. Previously, many studies addressed the relationship of general intelligence to academic performance, but few focused on the moral component of it, which plays a vital role in determining students' excellence and success. This study enhances our understanding of the moral dimensions influencing academic success, and highlights the importance of developing moral intelligence alongside general intelligence. Moral skills can be key to achieving success in many fields, including academics. It is also interesting to see how ethical variables such as integrity, responsibility, and empathy can impact students' academic performance and excellence. Continuing research in this field may open a new horizon for developing educational programs and their applications that contribute to enhancing moral values among students and improving their academic performance comprehensively.

Problem Statement:

The educational system is prone to crucial stages that frequently result in the creation of several moral and academic issues of a psychological nature. The problem in the current study lies in the factors that influence students' academic behaviour. Given that it is one of the most measurable results of the educational process, academic behaviour is one of the most significant and essential concerns that has attracted the attention of researchers in numerous educational fields. It serves as the main yardstick for evaluating the effectiveness of the educational process and its related components (Stiles et al., 2017). Academic entitlement is a widespread problem among learners (Blincoe & Garris, 2017; Bonaccio et al., 2016), which leads to negative and disturbing behaviours in the academic context, which is reflected in the poor quality of the educational process. These negative behaviours associated with academic entitlement include anger, negative competition, cheating, aggressiveness, increased conflicts between students and teachers, inability to adapt, selfishness, and lack of self-control (Reysen et al., 2020).

Following an analysis of the theoretical literature, it was discovered that the majority of earlier research had concentrated on examining the detrimental consequences of academic entitlements on students' moral dimensions and values. According to (Keener, 2020; Stiles et al., 2017), entitlement plays a significant role in negative behaviour, and there is a positive relationship between entitlement and personality traits; most students with a high level of entitlement engage in unethical behaviours like cheating and academic dishonesty and narcissism. Luckett et al. (2017) suggest that entitlement negatively affects learning and social relationships. Accordingly, the researchers perceive the importance of studying the relationship between moral intelligence and academic entitlements among university students through the study questions.

- 1- What is the level of moral intelligence among Al al-Bayt University students?
- 2- What is the level of academic entitlements among Al al-Bayt University students?
- 3- Are there statistically significant differences at the level of significance ($\alpha = 0.05$) in academic entitlements attributable to the variables of gender, academic specialisation, and academic level among Al al-Bayt University students?

- 4- What is the predictive ability of moral intelligence in academic entitlements among Al al-Bayt University students?

Theoretical importance:

Hopefully, this study will add new data related to academic entitlements and moral intelligence to Arabic literature- as far as the researchers know- this study is considered one of the unique studies that linked these variables at the local and Arab levels. It will open the way for conducting more similar studies. Its theoretical importance lies in the fact that it may open new horizons in educational psychology and mental health, as it draws the attention of educators to the seriousness of academic entitlements and their increasing prevalence among students, thus identifying its causes and negative effects and how to reduce them.

Practical Importance:

The results of this study may benefit those in charge of the educational process in Jordanian universities, as the study will provide them with knowledge about the causes of academic entitlements, their negative consequences, and how to deal with them and mitigate their effects. Educators will also benefit from it in holding courses on the importance of moral values and behaviours and adherence to them, and the importance of correctly assessing their capabilities so that they do not face unexpected academic entitlements that they can't cope with.

Definitions:

Moral Intelligence: It means the individual's ability to understand right from wrong and distinguish between them through a set of moral beliefs that he stored in his cognitive structure and which enables him to use correctly and acceptably by society (Borba, 2001). Operationally, it is the score the student obtains from the moral intelligence scale applied in this study.

Academi Entitlements:

Students feel they deserve special treatment because they pay for their education (Jackson et al., 2020). Operationally, it is defined as a student's score on the academic entitlements scale used in the current study.

Methods and Procedures

Approach:

The descriptive correlational approach was used in the current study because it is the most appropriate approach for achieving the goals of this study.

Population and Sample:

The study population consisted of all undergraduate students (n=17007) at Al -Bayt University registered in the second semester of the academic year 2022/2023, according to the data issued by the Admission and Registration Department. To choose the representative sample, the researchers choose several classes taking the prerequisite courses. The study sample consisted of (404) male and female students chosen using the convenient sample method.

Table (1) frequencies and percentages by the study variables

	Categories	Frequency	Percentage
Gender	Male	93	23.0
	Female	311	77.0
	Total	404	100.0
Collage	Scientific	213	52.7
	Humanities	191	47.3
	Total	404	100.0
Studying year	First	116	28.7
	Second	149	36.9
	Third	71	17.6
	Fourth	68	16.8
	Total	404	100.0

Instruments:

1. Moral intelligence (MI)

A measure of moral intelligence was built based on the theory of moral intelligence by Michel Borba and by referring to several previous studies (Nasser, 2009; Al-Adamat & AlWan, 2019; Al-Adamat et al., 2020). The measure consisted of (35) items distributed over seven dimensions: Sympathy (1-5), Conscience (6-10), Self-control (10-15), Respect (16-20), Kindness (20-25), Tolerance (26-30), and Justice (30-35).

Validity and Reliability**Face validity**

Face validity of the moral intelligence scale was verified by a committee of nine specialised faculty members in educational psychology, psychological counselling, and measurement and evaluation. They determine the suitability of the items to the area it measures, their clarity and the soundness of the linguistic formulation. A criterion (80%) was adopted for the inter-rater agreement. All suggested modifications were considered.

Construct validity:

The construct validity of the moral intelligence scale was checked by applying it to a pilot sample of (50) male and female students from Al al-Bayt University. Pearson correlation coefficients were calculated between the items score and the total score and its dimensions. The correlation coefficients between the scale's dimensions and the scale's total score ranged between (0.79-0.52), and the values of the correlation coefficients for the dimensions ranged between (0.75-0.46). Also, correlation coefficients were calculated between each item and the dimension it belongs to and the scale's total score. The values of the correlation coefficients between the items and their dimensions ranged between ((0.85-0.28), and the values of the correlation coefficients between the items with the total score ranged between (0.89-0.37).

Reliability:

The academic entitlement scale's reliability was verified by calculating the internal consistency coefficients using the Cronbach alpha equation on a pilot sample of (50) male and female students from Al al-Bayt University. The values of the stability coefficients using the internal consistency method (Cronbach alpha) ranged between (0.94-0.81) for the dimensions of the moral intelligence scale and (0.86) for the total score of the scale. Indicating an acceptable degree of reliability.

2. Academic Entitlement Scale (AE)

The academic entitlements scale developed by (Jackson et al., 2020) was used in this study because it is the most recent scale at the international level. It also includes seven general academic entitlement domains. The scale consists of (30) items within the seven domains, namely, Rewarding for Effort (1-4), Accommodation (5-8), Responsibility Avoidance (9-12), Student Orientation (13-16), Student (Customer) service expectations (17-20), and Grade Haggling. (24-21), and General academic entitlement (30-25). The validity and reliability of the original scale version were checked by (Jackson et al., 2020).

Validity:

In this study, the face validity of the measure was checked by presenting it to nine specialised faculty members in educational psychology, psychological counselling, and measurement and evaluation to check its relevance and appropriateness. A criterion (80%) was adopted for inter-rater agreement to make any required modifications. The construct validity was verified by applying the scale to a pilot sample (n=50) of male and female students from Al al-Bayt University. Pearson correlation coefficients were calculated between the item score and the total score of the scale and the accompanying domains. The correlation coefficients ranged between the domains of the scale and the total score of the scale (0.88-0.63), and the values of the correlation coefficients for the domains ranged between (0.71-0.41). The values of the correlation coefficients between the items and their domains ranged between (0.91-0.37). The values of the correlation coefficients between the items with the total score ranged between (0.44-0.88).

Reliability:

The internal consistency coefficients were calculated using Cronbach alpha to verify the reliability of the academic entitlement scale by applying it to a pilot sample of (50) male and female students from Al al-Bayt University. The values of the reliability coefficients using the internal consistency method (Cronbach alpha) ranged between (0.91-0.79) for the scale domains and (0.96) for the total score. Indicating that the scale has an acceptable degree of reliability.

Procedures:

To achieve the objectives of the study, the following procedures were followed:

- Preparing study tools and verifying their validity and reliability.
- Determining the study population refers to the Admission and Registration Unit statistics at Al al-Bayt University. Choosing a sample that represents the study population.
- Administering the study tools to the sample, clarifying the objectives of the study, giving them enough time to respond to the items of the two scales, answering the students' inquiries, asking them to answer truthfully, and informing them that the results are for scientific research only and will be treated in strict confidentiality.
- Collecting valid questionnaires for analysis. Entering the data into the computer to perform the appropriate statistical treatments.
- Concluding and discussing the results and making appropriate recommendations based on the study results.

Results and Discussion**1. What is the level of moral intelligence among Al al-Bayt University students?**

Means and standard deviation were extracted to answer this question. See Table (2).

Table (2) Results of Means and standard deviation of MI Scale

Rank	N	Domain	Mean	Std.	Level
3	1	Self-control	4.31	.651	High
2	2	Conscience	4.12	.678	High
5	3	Kindness	4.09	.693	High
6	4	Tolerance	4.06	.642	High
7	5	Fairness	3.97	.782	High
1	6	Empathy	3.91	.843	High
4	7	Respect	3.78	.732	High
		MI	4.03	.474	High

Data in Table (2) demonstrates that the means of the domains ranged between (3.78-4.31). Self-control ranked first with the highest mean (4.31), while Respect came in the last rank with a mean of (3.78). The total mean of the MI scale was (4.03).

2- What is the level of academic entitlements among Al al-Bayt University students?

Means and standard deviation were computed to answer this question. See Table (3) below.

Table (3) Results of Means and standard deviation of AE Scale

Rank	N	Domains	Mean	Std.	Level
5	1	Student (Customer) service expectations	3.78	.717	High
7	2	General academic entitlement	3.76	.490	High
3	3	Responsibility Avoidance	3.72	.814	High
1	4	Rewarding for Effort	3.41	1.022	Medium
2	5	Accommodation	3.31	.981	Medium
6	6	Grade Haggling	3.26	.972	Medium
4	7	Student Orientation (customer)	3.10	1.081	Medium
		Total AE	3.49	.581	Medium

Table (3) shows 1-7 domains of the AE Scale. The arithmetic means ranged between (3.10-3.78). The student (customer) service expectation domain topped the scale with the highest level (mean=3.78). In contrast, Student Orientation (customer) domain ranked last rank (mean= 3.10). The overall mean of the AE scale was (3.49).

3- Are there statistically significant differences at the level of significance ($\alpha = 0.05$) in academic entitlements attributable to the variables of gender, academic specialisation, and year of studying among Al al-Bayt University students?

Means and standard deviations of the respondents' responses were extracted to answer this question, as shown in Table (4).

Table (4) Results of mean and Standard deviation of respondents' responses by gender, specialisation and year of studying

Variables	Categories	Mean	N	Std.
Gender	Male	3.32	93	.576
	Female	3.55	311	.573
	Total	3.49	404	.581
College	Scientific	3.55	213	.572
	Humanities	3.43	191	.587
	Total	3.49	404	.581
Year of studying	First	3.49	116	.552
	Second	3.52	149	.657
	Third	3.53	71	.503
	Fourth	3.41	68	.530
	Total	3.49	404	.581

There are significant differences in the arithmetic means and standard deviations in the academic entitlement of Al al-Bayt University students attributed to gender, college, and year of studying. The three-way ANOVA was used to determine the significance of the statistical differences between the arithmetic means, as shown in Table (5).

Table (5) Results of the Three-way ANOVA analysis by gender, college & studying year

Source of variance	SS	DF	MS	F value	Sig
Gender	4.439	1	4.439	13.674	.000
College	2.788	1	2.788	8.587	.004
Year of Study	.874	3	.291	.897	.443
Error	129.213	398	.325		
Total	5067.667	404			

Data in Table (5) demonstrates that:

- Statistically significant differences ($\alpha = 0.05$) were found due to the effect of gender (f value = 13.674) and (p value= 0.000). The differences were in favour of females.
- Statistically significant differences ($\alpha = 0.05$) due to the effect of the college were observed. (F= 8.587) and (P= 0.004). The differences were in favour of the scientific college.
- No statistically significant differences ($\alpha = 0.05$) due to the effect of the year of study were found. as the (F= 0.897) and (P= 0.443).

4- What is the predictive ability of moral intelligence in academic entitlements among Al al-Bayt University students?

The values of the linear correlation coefficients were used to answer this question, as shown in Table (6).

Table (6) Matrix of inter-correlation coefficients between predictors

	Academic Entitlement
Empathy	.551(**)
Conscience	.385(**)
Self-control	.357(**)
Respect	.465(**)
Kindness	.490(**)
Tolerance	.412(**)
Fairness	.319(**)

*Statistically significant at (.05)

** Statistically significant at (0.01).

Table (6) shows a statistically significant positive relationship between moral intelligence and academic entitlement in all domains. To determine the percentage of variance explained by the variables predicting variance in the academic entitlement scale, Multiple linear regression analysis was used by adopting the Stepwise method to enter the predicted variables into the regression equation in the predictive model, as shown in Table (7).

Table (7) The results of the multiple regression test for the predictor variables and their multiple correlation coefficients and the amount of their interpretation according to the method of entering the predictor variables into the equation by the step method

Predictors	(R)	(R ²)	(R ₂)	(B)	(F)	Beta	(t)	β_0	P
Empathy	0.551	0.304	0.304	0.486	175.408	0.551	13.244	2.009	0.000
Respect	0.626	0.392	0.088	0.454	129.266	0.315	7.627	1.347	0.000
Tolerance	0.667	0.445	0.053	0.435	107.002	0.243	6.195	0.708	0.000
Fairness	0.682	0.464	0.019	0.428	86.507	0.159	3.785	0.511	0.000
Self-control	0.686	0.471	0.006	0.426	70.789	0.092	2.169	0.358	0.031

*Dependent variable: academic achievement scale

Table (7) demonstrates that Empathy, respect, Tolerance, Fairness, and Self-control are involved in predicting the academic entitlement scale. Together, they explained (47.1%) the variance in the academic entitlement scale. The empathy variable was the most predictive of the scale, as it explained (30.4%) of the variance, followed by Respect, which added (8.8%) to the variance, then Tolerance added (5.3%) to the variance, followed by Fairness, which added (1.9%) to the variance. Finally, Self-control added (0.6%) to the variance. The proportion of the explained variance for these variables was statistically significant at ($\alpha = 0.05$). However, Conscience and Kindness were not included in the prediction of the academic entitlement scale, given that the explained variance they added was not statistically significant at the significance level ($\alpha = 0.05$).

Table (7) indicates that an increase in Empathy by one standard unit (standard deviation) increases academic entitlement by (0.486) standard unit. And that the increase in Respect by one standard unit (standard deviation) increases the measure of academic entitlement by (0.454). And the increase in Tolerance by one standard unit (standard deviation) increases academic entitlement by (0.435) of the standard unit. And that

the increase in Fairness by one standard unit (standard deviation) increases the academic entitlement by (0.428) standard unit. And that the increase in Self-control by one standard unit (standard deviation) increases academic entitlement by (0.426) of the standard unit; Note that these predictive variables were statistically significant at the significance level ($\alpha = 0.05$).

Discussion

The responses to the first question demonstrated that Al al-Bayt University students had a high moral intelligence. The findings could be explained by the fact that students with high moral intelligence also exhibit good levels of responsibility in their behaviour and have the moral and mental skills necessary to distinguish between right and wrong, be aware of their abilities and those of others, and act accordingly. The idea put forward by Borba can be applied to clarify this result. Moral intelligence develops from the prior experiences that the student gains through his upbringing, schooling, religion, and interactions with the community in which he lives. In addition, the family has an important role in developing moral virtues by being the first to embrace the child and take care of him since his birth, as it is considered one of the most important primary social groups that instil general values for all. This result is consistent with the results of (Abu Romi & Al-Khalidi, 2017; Al-Momani, 2015), which indicated a high level of moral intelligence. In contrast, it differs from (Moghadas & Khaleghi, 2013; Guiab et al., 2015; Al-Adamat & Alwan, 2019; AlSmadi & AlZghoul, 2019), which indicates a medium level of moral intelligence. Students at Al al-Bayt University have a medium level of academic entitlement. This result may be supported by Dai et al. (2021), who claimed that students who participated in distance learning in different parts of the world as a result of the traffic restrictions imposed during the Corona pandemic developed irrational beliefs based on the notion that they deserve more advantages and marks because they went through difficult life experiences, whether on a social or academic level. Additionally, remote learning environments, which the majority of the sample in the current study experienced, have made them feel as though they haven't put much effort into their studies. This was mostly reinforced by university faculty members, who considered that students are going through abnormal circumstances that require them to ease the burdens of academic tasks provided to students and give them more privileges to reduce the negative impact of the Corona pandemic on their lives. The result differs from that of Aldabue, (2020); Sohr-Preston & Boswell, (2015), indicating a high academic entitlement level. It also disagrees with Ellis et al., (2021) that academic entitlement is low.

The results of the third question also showed statistically significant differences in the level of academic entitlement attributable to the effect of gender, where women overperformed men. The researchers attribute this result to the fact that the beliefs of academic entitlement rise among females due to their high self-confidence, which is supported by their use of social media that allow them to express themselves and obtain encouragement from their many followers freely. They developed a belief in obtaining preferential treatment and unrealistic benefits that distinguish them from the rest of their colleagues, regardless of their efforts, performance, and abilities.

These results can be explained by the cultural and social changes that created new values and ideas and altered some precepts that used to restrict women. As a result, women now have more social freedom across various fields and access to social support, which in turn gives them a chance to strive for the best, which increases their self-confidence and gives them the impression that, regardless of her talents and abilities, she always deserved the best.

This result is inconsistent with the results of (Seipel & Brooks, 2020; Pilottie et al., 2021), which revealed no statistically significant differences in academic entitlement attributable to the gender variable. And with (Ciani et al., 2008, Sohr-Preston & Boswell, 2015; Elias, 2017; Aldabue, 2020) reported statistically significant differences in academic entitlement due to the gender variable (males).

The results yielded statistically significant differences in the level of academic entitlement due to the impact of the college, and the differences were in favour of the scientific college. The researchers attribute this result to the fact that the students of the scientific colleges find their majors more difficult than the humanities major. In addition, the nature of the study in scientific colleges depends on scientific experiments, unlike the majors of the humanities colleges, which depend on preservation and distance from direct association with the environment surrounding. All these factors led to a rise in academic entitlement among students of scientific disciplines.

This result is inconsistent with the result of Aldabue(2020), which found statistically significant differences in the academic entitlement attributed to the college variable favouring humanities colleges. It also disagrees with the study of Seipel & Brooks(2020), which concluded no statistically significant differences in students' perceptions of academic entitlement according to the college variable.

The results did not show statistically significant differences in the level of academic entitlement due to the effect of the studying year. The researchers attribute this to the fact that university students at various levels have developed the concept of academic entitlement in the early stages of their academic life, and this means that the academic level does not give indications about the existence of differences given that any change process on this concept needs a long period.

This result supports the result of Ciani et al., (2008), which indicated no statistically significant differences in the level of academic entitlement attributable to the change in the teaching level. At the same time, it differs from Aldabou (2020), which found statistically significant differences in academic entitlement due to the variable year of study, and in favour of the first year.

The results of the fourth question showed that the variables involved in predicting the scale of academic entitlement are Empathy, Respect, Tolerance, Fairness, and Self-control, which explained (47.1 %) of the variance of the academic entitlement scale. The researchers attribute this result to the impact of ethics on academic entitlement. Student's morals are usually reflected in their academic behaviour and practices, as moral such as empathy, respect, tolerance, fairness, and self-control works to reduce academic entitlement, and it also limits unrealistic expectations that do not harmonise with their effort, capabilities, and their moral skills. Al-Obaidi and Al-Ansari (2016) emphasise that moral intelligence indicates understanding and interpreting students' behaviour and self-concept. Barque-Duran et al., (2016) claimed that university students face many unfavourable situations requiring them to employ their ethics and self-values in dealing with them.

Recommendations

In light of the study's findings, the researchers suggest:

- Holding seminars and workshops that educate university students about the importance of accurate and objective assessment of their true abilities.
- Offering training programs targeting faculty members to develop their skills in objective assessment based on students' efforts.

Research Ethics

During the preparation of this study, great attention was paid to observing research ethics and ensuring that researchers adhered to the principles of ethical behavior in all aspects of the research. Research ethics represents a set of values and principles that researchers must adhere to ensure integrity and purity in their research work and to protect the rights of study participants. In this study, a range of ethical practices were applied, including the following:

Maintaining the privacy of participants:

The confidentiality of the information and data collected from study participants was ensured, and it was guaranteed that no information related to them would be disclosed without their explicit consent.

Obtaining approval from relevant parties: Approval was obtained from relevant parties, including study participants and those responsible for organizing the research, before starting the study and collecting data.

Fair treatment of participants and data:

All study participants and the data used were treated fairly and impartially, without any bias or manipulation in the analysis or reporting.

Transparent Disclosure:

The transparency of all aspects of the study, including the objectives, method, and results, was emphasized to ensure that the study was replicable and clearly understood by others. Considering research ethics as an integral part of the scientific research process, observing and adhering to them guarantees integrity and seriousness in conducting the study and contributes to building the confidence of the scientific and public communities in the results and conclusions that follow from them.

Funding:

This research received no external funding.

Conflicts of interest:

The authors declare no conflict of interest in the design of the study; in the collection, analysis, or interpretation of data; in the writing of the manuscript, or in the decision to publish the results.

References:

1. Abdellatif, S. (2022). Moral Intelligence and Its Relationship to Academic Entitlement and Academic Performance of Secondary School Students, *European Journal of Educational Research*, 11(4), p2291-2301 2022.
2. Abu Awad, S. (2011). *The moral intelligence and its relationship to the school social behavior of the tenth grade of primary school*. Master Thesis, Hashemite University, Jordan.
3. Abu Jado, S & Nofal, M. (2007). *Teaching Thinking: Theory and Practice*. Amman: Dar Al Masirah for publication and distribution.

4. Abu Roumi, R & Al-Khalidi, J. (2017). Level of Moral Intelligence and its Relationship to Gender and Faculty among Students at AlZaytoonah University of Jordan. *Journal of Al-Quds University for Educational & Psychological Research & Studies*, 5(17), 115-126.
5. Achacoso, M. (2002). *What do you mean my grade is not an A? An investigation of academic entitlement, causal attributions, and self-regulation in college students*. Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Texas at Austin
6. Al Smadi, W & Al Zghoul, R. (2019). Moral Intelligence as Predictor for the Moral Conduct among Yarmouk University Students. *Journal of Al-Quds University for Educational & Psychological Research & Studies*, 11(29), 27-43.
7. Al-Adamat, A., Ghasawneh, J & Al-Adamat, O. (2020). Impact of Moral Intelligence on Green Purchase Intention. *Management Science Letters*, 10(9), 2063-2070.
8. Al-Adamat, O & Alwan, A. (2019). The Perceived Social Support and its Relationship to Moral Intelligence Among Tenth Grade Students in Schools of the Northeast Badia Directorate. *Journal of Psychological and Educational Sciences El-Oued University – Algeria*, 5(2), 199-220.
9. Aldabue, F. (2020). Academic Entitlement among University Students in the Light of Demographic Variables. *Educational Journal*, 77(77), 1-35.
10. Alhadabi, A., Aldhafri, S., Alkharusi, H., Al-Harthy, I., Alrajhi, M., & AlBarashdi, H. (2019). Modelling parenting styles, moral intelligence, academic self-efficacy and learning motivation among adolescents in grades 7–11. *Asia Pacific Journal of Education*, 39(1), 133-153.
11. AlMalki, F. (2019). Moral Intelligence and its Relation to the Control Locus among Gifted and Ordinary Adolescents in Bahrain's Public Schools. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Sciences*, 20(2), 135-166.
12. Al-Momani, A. (2015). The level of moral intelligence and its relationship to genders and the educational stream among high school students in the north area of Jordan. *The Jordanian Journal of Educational Sciences*, 11(1), 17-30.
13. Al-Obaidi, A & Al-Ansari, S. (2016). Moral Intelligence and its Relationship with Academic Adjustment for Sixth Year Primary School Pupils. *Journal of Educational and Psychological Research*, 31, 74-97.
14. Anggraeni, C., Herlina, A& Abdulaziz, M. (2022), The Impact of Transformational Leadership, Infrastructure, and Public Service Quality on Employee Performance at The District Prosecutor's Office, *International Journal of Management, Economic, Business and Accounting (IJMEBA)*. 1 (3): 71 – 81.
15. Aras, M. (2022), The Relationship between Academic Leaders Moral Intelligence and Ethical Leadership Behaviors, *Alanya Academic Review Journal*. 6 (3): 3309 – 3326.
16. Barque-Duran, A., Pothos, E., Yearsley, J. & Hampton, J. (2016). Pattern and Evolution of Moral Behavior: Moral Dynamics in Everyday Life. *Thinking and Reasoning*, 22(1) 31-56.
17. Blincoe, S., & Garri, C. (2017). Challenging the Assumption of a Western Phenomenon: Academic Entitlement in Saudi Arabia. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, 85(85), 278–290
18. Bonaccio, S., Reeve, C., & Lyster, J. (2016). Academic entitlement: Its personality and general mental ability correlates, and academic consequences. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 102, 211-216.
19. Borba, M. (2001). *Building Moral Intelligence: A Parent's Guide to Teaching the Seven Essential Virtues*. Jossey-Bass.
20. Borba, M. (2003). Tips for building moral intelligence in students. *Curriculum Review*, 42(7), 2-14.
21. Boswell, S. (2012). I deserve success: Academic entitlement attitudes and their relationships with course self-efficacy, social networking, and demographic variables. *Social Psychology of Education*, 15(3), 353-365
22. Bozaci, I. (2014). Moral Intelligence and Sustainable Consumption: A Field Research on Young Consumers. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 4 (11), 306-321.
23. Cain, J., Romanelli, F., & Smith, K. (2012). Academic entitlement in pharmacy education. *American Journal of Pharmaceutical Education*, 76(10), 1-8.
24. Campbell, W., Bonacci, A., Shelton, J., Exline, J., & Bushman, B. (2004). Psychological entitlement: Interpersonal consequences and validation of a self-report measure. *Journal of Personality Assessment*, 83(1), 29-45.
25. Chowning, K., & Campbell, N. (2009). Development and validation of a measure of academic entitlement: Individual differences in students' externalized responsibility and entitled expectations. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, 101(4), 982-997.
26. Ciani, K., Summers, J., & Easter, M. (2008). Gender differences in academic entitlement among college students. *The Journal of Genetic Psychology*, 169(4), 332-344
27. Clarken, R. (2010). *Considering Moral Intelligence as Part of a Holistic Education*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Denver, CO, April 30-May 4, 2010.
28. Coles, R. (2017). *The Moral Intelligence of Children: How to Raise a Moral Child*. New York: Plume Books. Edition (11)

29. Dai, Y., Lin, X., Su, S., & Li, L. (2021). The online learning achievement of Chinese students during the covid-19 pandemic: the role of self-regulated learning and academic entitlement. *International Journal of Psychology and Educational Studies*, 8(3), 116-127.
30. Elias, R. (2017) Academic entitlement and its relationship with perception of cheating ethics. *Journal of Education for Business*, 92(4), 194-199.
31. Ellis, J., Bacon-Baguley, T., & Otieno, S. (2021). Academic entitlement in physician assistant students. *The Journal of Physician Assistant Education*, 32(1), 1-9.
32. Fromuth, M. E., Bass, J. E., Kelly, D. B., Davis, T. L., & Chan, K. L. (2019). Academic entitlement: Its relationship with academic behaviors and attitudes. *Social Psychology of Education*, 22, 1153-1167.
33. Goldman, Z., & Martin, M. (2014). College Students' Academic Beliefs and Their Motives for Communicating With Their Instructor. *Communication Research Reports*, 31(4), 316-328
34. Goodboy, A. K., & Frisby, B. N. (2014). Instructional dissent as an expression of students' academic orientations and beliefs about education. *Communication Studies*, 65(1), 96-111.
35. Greenberger, E., Lessard, J., Chen, C., & Farruggia, S. (2008). Self-entitled college students: Contributions of personality, parenting, and motivational factors. *Journal of Youth and Adolescence*, 37(10), 1193-1204.
36. Guib, M., Sario, L. & Reyes, V. (2015). Self-Perceived Moral Intelligence of Faculty and Students: Its Implication to Teacher Education. *International Refereed Research Journal*, 6(2), 106-121
37. Hajjar, R. (2018). *The ethical intelligence of private basic school principals in Amman and its relation to the organizational culture in their schools from teachers' point of view*. Master Thesis, Middle East University, Jordan.
38. Heffernan, K., & Gates, T. G. (2018). Perceptions of teaching staff in human services about academic entitlement: Implications for staff well-being, education, and research. *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education*, 10(4), 469-477.
39. Jackson, D. L., Frey, M. P., McLellan, C., Rauti, C. M., Lamborn, P. B., & Singleton-Jackson, J. A. (2020). I Deserve More A's: A Report on the Development of A Measure of Academic Entitlement. *Plos one*, 15(9), 1-17.
40. Jackson, D. L., Singleton-Jackson, J. A., & Frey, M. P. (2011). Report of a measure of academic entitlement. *American International Journal of Contemporary Research*, 1(3), 53-65.
41. Jordan, P., Ramsay, S., & Westerlaken, K. (2017). A review of entitlement: Implications for workplace research. *Organizational Psychology Review*, 7(2), 122-142.
42. Kaliská, L. (2014). First Results from Verification of Psychometric Properties of D. Lennick's and F. Kiel's MCI Questionnaire for Measuring Moral Intelligence in Slovak Conditions. *The New Educational Review*, 37, 257-268.
43. Keener, A. (2020). An examination of psychological characteristics and their relationship to academic entitlement among millennial and nonmillennial college students. *Psychology in the Schools*, 57(4), 572-582.
44. Khojasteh, J., & Keener, A. (2018). Entitlement in higher education: Evaluating the measurement invariance properties of the academic entitlement questionnaire. *Journal of Psychoeducational Assessment*, 36(7), 750-755.
45. Kopp, J., & Finney, S. (2013). Linking academic entitlement and student incivility using latent means modeling. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, 81(3), 322-336.
46. Kopp, J., Zinn, T., Finney, S., & Jurich, D. (2011). The development and evaluation of the Academic Entitlement Questionnaire. *Measurement and Evaluation in Counseling and Development*, 44(2), 105-129
47. Kurtylmaz, Y. (2019). Adaptation of Academic Entitlement Questionnaire. *Anadolu Journal of Educational Sciences International*, 9(2), 314-351.
48. Lessard, J., Greenberger, E., Chen, C., & Farruggia, S. (2011). Are youths' feelings of entitlement always "bad"? Evidence for a distinction between exploitive and non-exploitive dimensions of entitlement. *Journal of Adolescence*, 34, 521-529.
49. Lockett, M., Trocchia, P. J., Noel, N. M., & Marlin, D. (2017). A typology of students based on academic entitlement. *Journal of Education for Business*, 92(2), 96-102.
50. McLellan, C. (2019). *Exploring Causes of Academic Entitlement: A Mixed-Method Approach*. Unpublished Doctoral dissertation, University of Windsor, Ontario, Canada.
51. McLellan, C., & Jackson, D. (2017). Personality, self-regulated learning, and academic entitlement. *Social Psychology of Education*, 20, 159-178.
52. Menon, M., & Sharland, A. (2011). Narcissism, Exploitative Attitudes, and Academic Dishonesty: An Exploratory Investigation of Reality versus Myth. *Journal of Education for Business*, 86, 50-55.
53. Moghadas, M. & Khaleghi, M. (2013). Investigate of Relationship Between Moral Intelligence and Distress Tolerance in Isfahan. *Journal of Research in Social Sciences*, 2(2), 26-31.
54. Alnasraween M., Alsmadi, M., Al-Zboon, H., & Alkurshe, T. (2022). The Level of Universities Students' Test Wiseness in Jordan during Distance Learning in Light of Some Variables , *Education Research International*, Volume 2022, Article ID 6381857, 10 pages, <https://doi.org/10.1155/2022/6381857>.

55. Nasser, A. (2009). *The effectiveness of a learning training program in developing moral intelligence among mistreated children*. PhD thesis, University of Jordan, Amman, Jordan.
56. Noor, S., Shanmugam, S & Rajoo, M. (2021), Factors Affecting Teachers Functional Competency Level in High-Performance Schools, *Malaysian Online Journal of Educational Management (MOJEM)*. 9 (2): 63 – 77.
57. Paudel, K. (2021), Level of Academic Performance Among Faculty Members in the Context of Nepali Higher Educational Institution, *Journal of Comparative & International Higher Education*. 13 (2): 98 – 111.
58. Peirone, A., & Maticka-Tyndale, E. (2017). “I bought my degree, now I want my job!” Is academic entitlement related to prospective workplace entitlement?. *Innovative Higher Education*, 42, 3-18.
59. Pilotti, M. A., Al Ghazo, R., & Al Shamsi, S. J. (2022). Academic entitlement amid social change in the Kingdom of Saudi Arabia. *Journal of Applied Research in Higher Education*, 14(4), 1718-1730.
60. Reysen, R. H., Degges-White, S., & Reysen, M. B. (2020). Exploring the Interrelationships Among Academic Entitlement, Academic Performance, and Satisfaction With Life in a College Student Sample. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory & Practice*, 22(2), 186-204. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1521025117735292>.
61. Reysen, R., Degges-White, S., Reysen, M. (2017). Exploring the Interrelationships among Academic Entitlement, Academic Performance, and Satisfaction with Life in a College Student Sample. *Journal of College Student Retention: Research, Theory & Practice*, 0(0), 1-19.
62. Seipel, S. & Brooks, N. (2020). Academic entitlement beliefs of information systems updates: A comparison with other business majors and an exploration of key demographic variables and outcomes. *Information Systems Education Journal (ISEDJ)*, 18(4), 46-59.
63. Sohr-Preston, S. & Boswell, S. (2015). Predicting academic entitlement in undergraduates. *International Journal of Teaching and Learning in Higher Education*, 27(2), 183-193.
64. Stiles, B. L., Wong, N. C. W., & LaBeff, E. E. (2017). College cheating thirty years later: The role of academic entitlement. *Deviant Behavior*, 39(7), 823-834
65. Turnipseed, D., & Cohen, S. (2015). Academic entitlement and socially aversive personalities: Does the Dark Triad predict academic entitlement ?. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 82, 72-75.
66. Whitaker, B. & Greenleaf, J. (2017). Using a Cultural Intelligence Assessment to Teach Global Leadership. *Journal of Leadership Education*, 16(1), 169-180.