The Reality of Public School Principals Applying Governance Standards to Gifted Programmes in the Eastern Region, from their Own Perspective

Qatnah, Al-Shammari[a], fathi, Abunasser[b] Samiah Al-Ghamdi[a], Badrya, Moaed Al-Otaibi[a],Samerasaeed[C]

[a]Doctoral Students: Researcher, College of Education, King Faisal University.2224000@student.kfu.edu.sa
[b]Professor of educational administration ,Educational Leadership department, College of Education, King Faisal University, fabonasser@kfu.edu.sa.
[C]SameraSaeed Al-Ghamdi,Ministry of education, Saudi Arabia,samarasaeed77@hotmail.com

Abstract:

The study aims to identify the degree of male and female school principals applying governance standards (partnership, transparency and accountability) to gifted programmes at the intermediate level in public schools within the eastern region. Furthermore, it attempts to identify differences between governance standards that might be attributed to gender, academic qualification, and management experience. The study adopted the descriptive survey approach due to it being propitious to the nature of the study. After checking the psychometric features of the governance standard scale, a questionnaire was applied to the study sample of 50 male and female principals of public schools at the intermediate level within the directorate of education in the eastern region. Data were processed using arithmetic means, correlation coefficients, the T test, and ANOVA.The findings revealed that both types of principals scored "high" in applying governance standards to gifted students' programmes. The "partnership" standard was "highest", while "transparency" and "accountability" standards were equal. Moreover, the findings revealed that there were differences with statistical significance at the function level (a = ≤ 0.05) in favour of females' application of governance standards, but there was no difference with statistical significance pertaining to the variables of experience and academic qualification among the sample members.

Keywords: Accountability; Governance; Partnership; Schools of the gifted; Transparency

1. Introduction

Developing educational systems is an urgent necessity at present because via such systems, one can face age changes, besides future expectations in various domains of education. Therefore, governments attempt to constantly update and develop these systems to enable future generations to confront challenges dictated by scientific developments and global changes. Currently, constant new changes are emerging, the foremost of which are: updating the methods of educational management and improving their elements in educational institutions so as to secure institutional management that cares for partnership, empowerment, transparency and accountability in order to avoid all forms of traditional methods of management and centralisation which dominated in the past (Mohammedi, 2019: 364).

Governance is one of the modern management methods which educational institutions adopt in an attempt to put an end to the crisis from which education suffers. Such a thing is manifested in the gap between tangible reality caused by the contradiction between higher management and its executive counterpart in institutions of education. Such an issue weakens those institutions, which is the reason as to why they heed the application of governance in order to achieve community satisfaction (Mahmoud, 2016).

The Arab Organization for Education, Culture, and Sciences (AOECS) (2013), in its study of patterns of governance pertaining to educational systems, pointed out that educational governance is one of the important issues for school management and community because it directly relates to teachers, students and people (Qurashi, 2020: 224).

Gifted students are considered a human resource whose value exceeds that of any financial or other natural resource; they are the national wealth who have intrinsic readiness, extraordinary potential, and performance that distinguish them from their peers in one or more of the domains appreciated by the community. Such domains include: mental excellence, creativity, academic achievement, and special skills which are reflected in the development of their society (Albani, 2020: 508).

In general, not many studies have tackled programmes and policies of the gifted, but through observing psychological and social needs, besides the needs of the schools which the gifted join, the researchers could perceive a basis for governance programmes and policies that nurture the gifted. This could lead to the achievement of objectives through various educational experiences, school management, teachers, programme supervisors, or even contribution from the local community (Ojeilat, 2017).

2.Statement of the problem

Studies have ascertained that gifted students need fostering, interest, counselling and guidance, no less than the needs of ordinary students or those with learning difficulties. If they are not provided with suitable care, it could lead to dispersion, thus denying them the educational changes designed, when systems do not provide the necessary services to cope with their potential. Schools and employees have not been developed either to meet the requirements of such groups (Khatib, Hadeedi, 2009).

A lack of interest in the gifted from educational institutions is one of the glitches in this domain. How will these institutions care for excellence and creativity as long as many quality aspects of the educational system are still below expectation when the minimal needs and environment necessary for excellence are not secured? (Tawfik, Qurashi, 2006:53).

Raddadi et al. (2012:276) pointed out that gifted programmes, in the Arab environment in general and in Saudi Arabia in particular, mainly focus on the impact of gifted programmes upon some variables, but not on applying the systems that focus on developing such programmes.

Applying governance standards constitutes part of the requirements for developing education according to Vision 2030, whose aim is to upgrade the competence and activity of the educational system. The 10th development plan calls for applying governance to the educational domain through spreading and implementing governance standards, developing the internal and external competence of the educational system, and developing the educational system and bylaws in order to achieve the principles of justice and competitiveness (Qurashi, 2020:225).

In accordance with the interest of the Ministry of Education with regard to improving educational quality, and due to its adoption of the concept of governance and implementing decentralisation and activation of societal participation, it has become necessary to apply governance standards in order to achieve a qualitative jump in schools and improve the levels of performance to achieve good-quality outcomes (Azmi, 2016).

Previous studies have revealed that the reality of applying governance standards to education in general needs reconsideration. The results of Sawadi (2015) revealed that the degree of governance application in Saudi universities was "weak", but the studies of Aseeri (2011), Nushan (2016), Fawwaz (2015) and Areeni (2014) all found that the degree of governance application in those universities was "medium".

In light of what preceded and through the researchers' review of previous studies that have tackled gifted programmes in public or private schools, they realised that such programmes did not relate to modern educational systems like governance. The statement of the problem within the current study has thus been limited to the following major question: What is the reality of principals of public schools applying governance standards to gifted programmes in the eastern region, from their own perspective?

The question is subdivided into the following:

1- What is the reality of the principals of those schools applying governance standards regarding the domains of accountability, partnership and transparency?

2- Are there differences with statistical significance at the function level ($a \leq 0.05$) between the means of the sample responses pertaining to the application of gifted programme governance by public school principals with regard to the variables of gender, management, experience, and academic qualification??.

3. Objectives of the study

The current study aims to:

1- Identify the reality of public school principals applying governance standards to gifted programmes in the domain of the study tool incorporated into: accountability, partnership and transparency, from their own perspective.

2- Detect if there are differences with statistical significance at the function level ($a = \geq 0.05$) between the means of the study sample responses with regard to public school principals applying governance standards to gifted programmes pertaining to the variables of type of management experience and academic qualification.

4.Significance of the study:

First: Theoretical significance

The significance of the study stems from the importance of the topic tackled, which can be outlined as follows:

- The study helps in criticising and governing the methods of detecting the gifted in public schools.
- It might help planners to develop administrative and political methods for nurturing the gifted.
- It might also help in devising a list of standards which could be used in governance policies and gifted programmes.
- It is hoped that the study might enrich Arab libraries with knowledge relevant to governance and gifted care.

Second: Applicability Significance

This significance lies in the study's attempt to identify the major principles of governance and gifted programmes in public schools which might help to overcome the management problems that principals encounter and to consolidate positive administrative performance.

5. Limitations of the study

The limitations of the study are determined as follows:

1- Subject limitation: The subject was limited to public school principals' application of governance standards to gifted programmes with regard to accountability, partnership and transparency, from their own perspective, regarding governance standards pertaining to the variables of management experience type and academic qualification.

2- Human limitation: The study was confined to principals of public schools at the intermediate level within the general directorate of education in the eastern region.

3- Space limitation: The study was conducted in the general directorate of education in the easternregion.

4- Time limitation: The study was conducted in the first semester (1443 AH).

6.Theoretical framework:

6.1. Governance concept

Linguistically speaking, the term "governance" means knowledge and jurisdiction (which is equivalent to justice). When someone is described as wise, it means that experiences made him or her so. The wise one is he or she who perfects things (Rowdan, 2021: 656).

The term "governance" originally derived from the verb "govern", which means to control things. It is a Greek word that expresses the capability and skills of a captain of a ship to control it in tumultuous seas with the intention of saving the souls of the crew (besides property). When a ship harbours safely, people say that the governing captain made it (Buqami, 2021: 602).

As for the definition of the term "governance", Buqami (2021: 602) defined it in a more comprehensive manner to incorporate partnership transparency, accountability, skill, justice achievement, competence, and law enforcement, which can be practised by the state, the private sector, and civil society for the purpose of achieving sustainable development.

For Shawish (2021: 14), governance is a system that includes laws, standards and rules that govern the relation between institutional leadership and beneficiaries in a way that secures correct practices of institutional authorities to make reasonable and correct decisions.

6.2. Reasons behind emergence of governance in the modern era

Governance emerged in the modern era because of the low level of performance of governmental bodies and the spread of the corruption phenomenon worldwide. Such a thing necessitated the adoption of mechanisms that force authorities to be more transparent to eliminate this phenomenon, to protect public money, to improve performance, and to activate censorship (Shaftoe, 2021; Abu Nasser, 2015: 66).

6.3. Significance of gifted programs governance in public schools:

The positive impact of the government makes governance activation in several management departments very important, especially for gifted programmes. Moreover, it secures a successful method that leads to more competent and active work which eventually puts an end to stagnation and corruption. Thus, governance is important because it helps to accomplish effective performance, which sequentially increases confidence in institutions, protects the rights and responsibilities of all employed individuals, improves decision-making processes relevant to an organisation, and endeavours to create a balance between economic goals and societal needs.

6.4. Principles of gifted programs governance in public schools

There are general governance principles issued by specialised international bodies such as the International Monetary Fund, the World Bank, and others. Those principles support countries' efforts to improve the legal institutional and organisational framework relevant to the governance of educational bodies in such countries. In general, the governance of gifted programmes should be based on a number of principles, the most relevant of which to the current study are:

Transparency: This refers to providing information and openness, allowing those in charge to obtain the information needed to protect their interests, make propitious decisions, and detect errors. Transparency bodies have clear procedures in decision making and in opening channels of communication between people of responsibility.

Partnership: This can be achieved through various mechanisms such as forming various counselling boards and committees for the external and internal beneficiaries of gifted programmes in public schools.

Accountability: This principle holds those who work in public schools accountable for the practices of which they are in charge. Accountability incorporates legal frameworks and organisational, strategic and procedural structures which encourage workers in schools of the gifted to abide by rules and bylaws to achieve competence and effectiveness.

Giftedness: According to the definition from the Saudi Ministry of Education, the gifted refer to talented children and adults who have abnormal capabilities and performances distinguishing them from others in more than one domain of great value to society. Therefore, they need special educational care (which a normal curriculum does not provide).

Gifted programmes: The King Abdulaziz and His Companions Foundation for Giftedness and Creativity (2019) defines these as programmes whose aim is to detect and nurture the gifted and the creative in scientific fields of national priority.

Albani (2020: 513) defines them as programmes that the Ministry of Education has prepared to secure different types of experience that provide students with opportunities to identify their skills and help decision makers to discover giftedness to boost them.

6.5. The status of gifted programs at public schools in Saudi Arabia

Qaffari (2021: 659) pointed out that Saudi Arabia has been a pioneer in detecting and nurturing the gifted by developing their talent via private and public programmes. The official document issued by the higher committee of education was the manifestation of such a policy. That document included three items (192, 193, 194) which determine the educational policy regarding nurturing the gifted in the Kingdom (Abu Nasser &Jugheiman, 2012: 197).

The programmes of gifted care witnessed a remarkable development in the Kingdom through creating the foundation of King Abdul Aziz in 1420 AH to care for the gifted. This is a national institution headed by the custodian of the two holy mosques, which aims to detect and nurture the gifted in compliance with the educational policy in the Kingdom. In 1421 AH, a general administration was created to detect the gifted and care for them in order to accomplish the educational policy in this respect (Muntashiri, 2008).

Later, "Misk" (a non-profit corporation) was instituted in 2011 by His Highness, Crown Prince Mohammed Bin Salman, in order to encourage teaching and develop leadership skills amongst the youth to guarantee a better future for the Kingdom (Misk Corporation, 2020).

7.Literature review

In this part of the study, the researchers will outline the major works whose topics are relevant to theirs. These are as follows:

The study of Raee (2021) aimed to identify the reality of teaching staff members applying electronic governance in state universities in Jordan and its relation to management empowerment, from their own perspective. The study used a descriptive approach in which the data were collected via a questionnaire. The study sample comprised 367 staff members. The findings revealed that teaching staff members applying electronic governance and practising management empowerment was ranked as "medium". Furthermore, they unveiled a correlation between application and empowerment.

The study of Alqahtani&Kallapen (2020) aimed to identify the quality of standards with regard to teaching the gifted in some countries. Fifty-eight research papers from 21 countries were reviewed to extract a parcel of practices, processes, and educational theories designed to reinforce teaching the gifted. The findings revealed that gifted students, despite being distinctive, were mostly taught in public schools. The curricula in such schools did not suit their potential. Such a thing disclosed the weakness of gifted programmes in most countries covered by the study.

The study of Jaraydeh (2020) aimed to construct a proposed model to apply management transparency to institutions of public education. The study used a qualitative–quantitative approach in which data were collected via a model designed by the researcher and comprised 54 standards. The study sample consisted of 100 management supervisors from the Ministry of Education in Jordan. The results revealed that the model designed was highly valid and reliable with regard to all of its six dimensions. It was a reliable tool with which one could

measure the degree of practising transparency domains in public educational institutions so as to pinpoint areas of weakness and strength in such systems.

Alfi&Harthi (2019) conducted a study to identify a correlation between the degree of primary school leaders in the Taif governorate practising management transparency and its relation to the school environment, from the perspective of teachers. The study adopted a correlative descriptive approach using a questionnaire to collect data. The study sample comprised 357 teachers. The results revealed that there were differences with statistical significance in teachers' evaluation of the degree of practising management transparency pertaining to the variable of years of experience, which was in favour of the group with less than 10 years of experience, as well as the variable of training for fewer than 10 courses, besides the variables of academic qualifications (which were in favour of teachers with BAs). The results also revealed that there was a correlation between the degree of practising management transparency and school ambience (from the perspective of teachers).

The study of Bashir (2019) aimed to identify principles of governance theory and application requirements in the Sudan. The study used a descriptive analytical approach. Data were collected from reviewing documents and books. The results showed that governance application was rated as "medium".

Kadir (2019) conducted a study to investigate issues of good governance in educational and management systems in secondary schools in Nigeria, besides the relation between human resources management, accountability, participatory decisions, and the management of secondary schools. The study adopted a descriptive approach using a questionnaire to collect data. The study sample comprised 175 principals and 364 teachers. The results revealed that there was a positive significant correlation between human resources management, accountability, participatory decisions, and secondary school management.

Alshaer et al. (2017) conducted a study to identify the role of state universities in reinforcing partnerships with non-governmental organisations in the Gaza Strip (from the perspective of employees in those universities). The study adopted a descriptive analytical approach and a questionnaire was used to collect data. The study sample comprised 228 employees who were selected randomly. The findings revealed that there was a relation with statistical significance between governance with all of its domains (laws and regulations, academic freedom, accounting, accountability, board of directors, beneficiary rights, transparency, and disclosure) and partnership reinforcement with universities and civil society organisations. From what preceded, one can note that the current study agreed with that of Alqahtani&Kalippen (2020) in identifying the governance status in institutions of gifted care. The remainder of the studies investigated the status of governance in higher education institutions in general. Such studies were:Raee (2021) and Alfi and Harthi (2019).

The current study is distinctive because it endeavoured to identify the status of governance in the domains of accountability, partnership and transparency in schools and gifted care institutions in Saudi Arabia. To the knowledge of the researchers, it is the first of its kind to tackle such an issue in the Kingdom.

8. Methodology

To achieve its objectives, the study adopted a descriptive survey approach, defined by Obeidat et al. (1996:223) as "studying the phenomenon as it really is by explaining it qualitatively or quantitatively. The qualitative explanation describes the phenomenon and its characteristics, but the quantitative provides a digital description illustrating phenomenon's amount, or size and its relation to other phenomena".

8.1. Study population and sample

The study population comprised all male and female principals of public schools at the intermediate level in the eastern region in the academic year 1443 AH, which amounted to 320, the permissible number to take from the website of the Ministry of Education. The sample was randomly selected and the questionnaire was electronically distributed to the sample members via Google Drive. A maximum three-week period was given for respondents to send back their responses. The total number of complete collected questionnaires that were statistically analysed was 50, representing 15.6% of the total population of the study.

8.2. Study tools

After reviewing previous literature relevant to the topic of the current study, the researchers designed and developed a questionnaire to achieve the study objectives and answer its questions. In its final shape, the questionnaire comprised two parts:

1- The first: This covers individuals' personal data related to gender, management experience, and academic qualification.

2- The second: This includes the questionnaire, which comprises 30 items divided into three domains (accountability, partnership and transparency)..

8.3. Validity of the questionnaire

To verify the validity of the study tool, the researchers adopted two methods: virtual validity (in which the questionnaire was sent to a group of specialists in the field for their opinion), and the Guttman validity coefficient. The following are the steps that the researcher followed to verify the validity.

8.4. Virtual validity

The tool is considered to be valid whenever it measures that for which it is designed. To ensure validity, the first step taken was to send the questionnaire to eight competent judges specialising in the field for their opinion regarding the language, clarity and items. Suggested modifications, amendments and deletions were taken into consideration until the researchers reached its final shape. The second step was to compute Guttman's coefficient for validity, which amounted to 0.854 (a high-validity coefficient which assures that the questionnaire is highly valid and reliable).

8.5. Evaluating questionnaire reliability

In computing the reliability coefficient of the questionnaire, three different methods were used: Cronbach's alpha, internal consistency scale, and split-half method.

	Method of computing reliability coefficient	Results
Cronbach Alpha	First part	0.937
	Second part	0.952
Split-half method (Spearman)		0.924
Split-half method (Guttman)		0.924

The results show that all reliability coefficients are good and reliable; therefore, the questionnaire enjoys a high degree of validity and reliability.

The researchers distributed the questionnaire electronically. The results will be analysed, explained, and then recommendations and suggestions will be provided.

To interpret the responses to items within the questionnaire and performance in general, the study adopted the following statistical standard:

Table.1. An evaluation scale in accordance with Likert's 5- point scale

Weighted average	Level
1 - 1.80	Very low
1.81- 2.40	Low
2.41- 3.20	Medium
3.21- 4	High
4.01- 5	Very high

9. Study results and discussion

9.1 Results related to the first question

"What is the reality of applying governance standards…?"
In answering the question, arithmetic means and standard deviations for each domain (accountability, partnership, and transparency) were calculated as presented in table 2.

Table.2. Results pertaining arithmetic means and standard deviations for the items of all domains and the questionnaire

Domain	Arithmetic mean	Standard deviation
Accountability	3.5550	.83612
Partnership	3.2202	.93095
Transparency	3.5550	.83612
Total	3.3766	.79429

Table 2 shows that the domain of partnership obtained the lowest mean (3.220) and a deviation of 0.931 with a "high" rank. The domains of accountability and transparency obtained an equal mean of 3.555 with a "high" rank; the questionnaire as a whole obtained a mean of 3.377 and a deviation of 0.794, indicating that the governance of gifted programmes in public schools was well done.

As for applying programme governance standards to levels of the dimensions, it was as follows:

1- Applying governance standards to the accountability domain was determined by calculating the arithmetic means for every questionnaire item. The results are presented in Table 3.

Table.3. Means and deviations for responses of public-school principals pertaining accountability domain (No= 50)

No.	Item	Mean	Deviation	Rank	Rate
1	School management explains the mechanism adopted in applying accountability to gifted programs.	2.7800	1.23371	Medium	8
2	School management has an internal monitoring system for gifted programs to provide reports about employees' performance.	2.8600	1.22907	Medium	7
3	School management inclines to achieve quality by applying accountability to gifted programs.	2.9200	1.14000	Medium	6
4	School internal regulations are distinguished for reliability.	3.5000	.95298	High	3
5	School management provides illustrations and facts on accomplished and non-accomplished procedures.	3.7800	1.11190	High	2
6	School management promotes the will in employees to abide by rules.	2.7400	1.33722	Medium	9
7	The school develops performance indicators for its employees.	3.460	1.1643	High	4
8	School administration gives verbal advice before resorting to written accountability	4.3200	.89077	Very high	1
9	There are public documents explaining items of expenditure of operating budget for gifted programs.	3.3200	1.36187	High	5
	Total	**3.5550**	**.83612**	**High**	

Table 3 shows that responses' means pertaining to accountability ranged from 2.7400 to 4.3200). Item 8 ("School administration gives …") ranked "high" and was rated first with a mean of 4.3200 and a deviation of .83612. This might be attributed to schools prioritising human relations as an initial solution to maintaining good relations between administration, teachers, and school employees. The researchers believe that female principals prefer to solve problems with teachers in a friendly manner, but if advice does not work, then they resort to the other solution, i.e. accountability through writing. This is a kind of punishment to which principals resort when problems become difficult to solve, as revealed by the responses of principals.Item 6 ("School administration promotes the will …") ranked "medium" and was rated ninth with a mean of 2.7400 and a deviation of 1.33722. This might be attributed to principals' belief that abiding by laws is an inseparable part of the job which every teacher should maintain. Among the ethical conditions of the job of teaching is that every teacher or employee has to abide by the laws of the Ministry of Education, in addition to the instructions by which school management abides. Therefore, schools could not do much for teachers and employees in this respect. Accountability, in general, obtained a mean of 3.298, which implies that managing gifted programmes in public schools was "high". This might be attributed to the official and non-official interest in programmes of the gifted at the Kingdom level.

Being under focus from the Ministry, guardians and society, schools care too much to abide by all laws and regulations that govern such levels and programmes. Due to the competition at the regional and international levels, the Kingdom pays too much care to maintain high quality in gifted programmes. Such a result agrees with those of Kadir (2019) and Alshaer et al. (2017), but disagrees with the result of Araee (2021).

2- Actual application of governance standards to gifted programmes pertaining to the partnership domain was done through computing means, standards, rankings and ratings, as presented in Table 4.

Table.4. Arithmetic means and standard deviations for the responses of principals pertaining partnership domain (N= 50)

No.	Item	Mean	Deviation	Rank	Rate
1	School management involves local community in designing and providing caring programs for the gifted	2.8800	1.39445	Medium	7
2	School management involves students and guardians in determining programs and services needed for the gifted.	3.0400	1.36964	Medium	6
3	School management involves all beneficiaries in evaluating gifted programs.	2.8800	1.28793	Medium	7
4	School management gives opportunity to employees to frankly express their opinions regarding problems the gifted programs face.	3.7600	1.11685	High	1
5	Teachers' partnership in decision making and planning programs for the gifted is apparent.	3.1600	1.28349	Medium	4
6	Develop indicators to measure the extent to which guardians and teachers are involved in building and implementing gifted programs.	2.8600	1.16075	Medium	8
7	School management encourages partnership in academic and administrative activities.	3.7000	.93131	High	2
8	Partners and employees are given the chance to evaluate school management.	3.1000	1.11117	Medium	5
9	School management promulgates team work culture in gifted programs through gatherings and periodic meetings.	3.6000	1.10657	High	5
	Total	**3.2202**	**.93095**	**High**	

Table 4 reveals that the means of the responses of sample members pertaining to the partnership domain ranged from 2.86 to 3.76. Item 4 ("School management gives opportunity …") ranked "high" and was rated first with a mean of 3.76 and a deviation of 1.11685. This might be attributed to the partnership of teachers and employees in the process of decision making and in discussing points of weakness and strength that gifted programmes face. It is an aspect of the commitment to abiding by the programmes approved by the Ministry of Education in Saudi Arabia which are put into effect.

Item 6 ("Develop indicators to measure the extent …") was rated last among the items of partnership with a mean of 2.8600 and a deviation of 1.16075. Such a thing reveals that the degree of guardians' partnership in building and implementing gifted programmes, despite their significance, did not exist. Therefore, more attention needs to be paid to this domain by getting students' parents to become more involved and participate in the programmes that care for their children. The researchers disclosed a serious point stated by school principals which should be taken into consideration in order to upgrade the quality of gifted programmes: the active partnership of guardians and developing indicators to measure such partnership. The results also show that, in general, the partnership domain ranked "high" from the perspective of female school principals. Such a result disagrees with the study of Alqahtani&Kallapen (2020), which revealed that the quality of gifted programmes was weak in general, but agrees with the study of Bashir (2019), which revealed that the status of applying governance to education was "medium".

3- Actual application of governance standards to gifted programmes pertaining to the transparency domain was obtained through computing arithmetic means, standard deviations, rankings, and ratings, as presented in Table 5.

Table.5. Results of arithmetic means and standard deviations for transparency item

No.	Item	Number	Mean	Deviation
1-	School management adopts a clear policy with regard to announcements about all gifted programs.	50	3.6200	1.22708
2-	School management prepares information necessary for gifted programs.	50	3.7200	1.05056
3-	School management applies mechanisms that secure integrity in selecting students for gifted programs.	50	4.0000	1.17803
4-	School management provides mechanisms to deal with complaints regarding gifted programs.	50	3.5600	1.12776
5-	School management assesses satisfaction of students' guardians who benefit from gifted programs.	50	3.5000	1.01519
6-	School management gets feedback at the end of the year and discusses that with school teamwork.	50	3.5400	1.01439
7-	The school keeps files for gifted students which contain complete information about points of excellence.	50	3.6200	1.14089
8-	School administration discusses, with its employees, its position with regard to gifted programs.	50	3.2400	1.28667
9-	The school discloses deficiencies found in gifted programs with transparency and clarity.	50	3.2600	1.15723
10-	School management informs its employees about budget expenditures related to gifted students.	50	3.1000	1.24949
11-	School management periodically discloses its objectives for both employees and partners.	50	3.5200	1.12920
12-	School employees are informed about administrative decisions relevant to their jobs.	50	3.9800	1.02000
	Mean of transparency domain	50	3.5550	.83612
	Valid N (Listwise)	50		

Table 5 shows that item 10 ("School management informs its employees ...") obtained the lowest arithmetic mean (3.10) and a deviation of 1.249; item 3 ("School management applies mechanisms ...") obtained the highest mean (4.00) and a deviation of 1.178 with a "high" rank. The transparency domain as a whole obtained a mean of 3.555 and a deviation of 0.836 with a "high" rank. From such results, one can deduce that the transparency domain regarding gifted programmes was very well done in public schools. The results show that the integrity item regarding selecting gifted students was the highest, which might be attributed to the fact that schools follow a certain mechanism that complies with the objectives of the Ministry of Education. Saudi Arabia

uses a scale designed by the National Center for Measurement and Evaluation. This scale provides people with an adequate amount of comprehensive information about the process of candidacy. In addition, there are supervisory committees in the Ministry of Education for detection and reviewing; thus, it enjoys a high level of integrity in identifying and directing care programmes. The expenditure and revenues item was the lowest due to the variety of needs and the number of students. It is noteworthy that the Kingdom's Vision 2030 recommends diversifying funding sources, upgrading performance efficiency, diversifying and rationalising expenditure, and encouraging societal partnership (be it through individuals or corporates). Schools and educational administrations withhold data and financial information in case it affects their workflow. Such a result agrees with the study of Jaraydi (2020) regarding transparency practice in schools, with Alfi and Harthy (2020) regarding the relation between transparency practice and school ambience, and with Bashir (2019) with regard to the transparency of infrequent occurrence.

9.2 Results related to the second question

Second question: "Are there differences with statistical significances at the functional level…"?

In answering the question, arithmetic means, (t) value, function level (sig) for gender variable are calculated as shown in table 6.

Table.6. Means of gender variable for males and females

Statement	Gender	Number	Mean	(t) value	Degree of freedom d f	Function level sig	Commentary
Accountability domain	Males	28	3.336	-2.166	48	0.035	Functional
	Females	22	3.834				
Partnership domain	Males	28	2.973	-2.205	48	0.032	Functional
	Females	22	3.535				
Transparency domain	Males	28	3,336	-2.166	48	0.035	Functional
	Females	22	3.834				
Questionnaire as a whole	Males	28	3.156	-2.311	48	0.028	Functional
	Females	22	3.657				

Table 6 shows that the (t) value for the accountability domain was 2.166, the degree of freedom (DF) was 48, and the function level was 0.035, which is statistically significant at the level of a ≥ 0.05; the (t) value for partnership was 2.205, DF was 48, and the function level was 0.032, which is statistically significant at the level of a ≥ 0.05; the (t) value for transparency was 2.166, DF was 48, and the function level was 0.035, which is statistically significant at the level of a ≥ 0.05; and the (t) value for the questionnaire as a whole was 2.311, DF was 48, and the function level was 0.028, which is statistically significant at the level of a ≥ 0.05.

The preceding results indicate that there were differences with statistical significance for the gender variable (0.05), in favour of females. Such a thing implies that governance was better in female schools than in male schools. This might be attributed to the resilience that males had in applying systems, while females were serious. The findings here disagree with those of Araee (2021), who stated that there were no differences between males and females with respect to the application of governance. As for the variable of academic qualification, arithmetic means, standard deviations, (t) values, and function levels were computed, as presented in Table 7.

Table.7. Results of (t) test for the variable of academic qualification

Statement	Qualification	Number	Mean	(t) value	Degree of freedom d f	Function level sig	Commentary
Accountability domain	B. A	42	3.534	-0.412	48	0.682	Non-functional
	Post-graduate	8	3.667				
Partnership domain	B. A	42	3.188	-0.555	48	0.582	Non-functional
	Post-graduate	8	3.389				

Transparency domain	B. A	42	3.534	-0.412	48	0.682	Non-functional
	Post-graduate	8	3.667				
Questionnaire as a whole	B. A	42	3.359	-0.360	48	0.721	Non-functional
	Post-graduate	8	3.470				

Table 7 shows that the (t) values are 0.412, 0.555, 0.412, and 0.360 for all domains within the questionnaire (accountability, partnership, transparency, and questionnaire as a whole), respectively, with the DF being 48 and the function levels being 0.682, 0.582, 0.682, and 0.721, respectively; they were all non-functional.

The preceding values indicate that there were no differences with statistical significance at the function level (a ≥ 0.05) pertaining to the qualification variable, which means that all sample members agree that the governance of gifted programmes is done in close degrees. Such a result agrees with that of Araee, which indicated that qualification as well as management qualities never affect governance.

To explain the differences pertaining to the variable of years of experience, the (F) values, function levels, and ANOVA were computed, as shown in Table 8.

Table.8. Results of the analysis for years of experience variance ANOVA

Statement	Variance source	Square total	Degree of freedom d f	Square mean	F value	Function level sig	Commentary
Accountability domain	Between groups	0.056	2	0.028	0.039	0.962	Non-functional
	Within groups	34.20	47	0.728			
	Total	34.256	49				
Partnership domain	Between groups	0.441	2	0.221	0.247	0.782	Non-functional
	Within groups	42.025	47	0.894			
	Total	42.466	49				
Transparency domain	Between groups	0.056	2	0.028	0.039	0.962	Non-functional
	Within groups	34.20	47	0.728			
	Total	34.256	49				
Questionnaire as a whole	Between groups	0.087	2	0.044	0.067	0.963	Non-functional
	Within groups	30.827	47	0.656			
	Total	30.914	49				

Table 8 revealed that the (F) values for all domains, besides the questionnaire as a whole, were not statistically significant, thus indicating that there were no differences with statistical significance pertaining to the years of experience of the sample members. Such a thing might be attributed to the inadequate application of quality by administrations when executing regulations and procedures. Had the case been different, a significant role of governance application would have been noted. The study results here disagree with that of Araee (2021), which concluded that more experience improves the application of governance standards.

10. Recommendations

The researchers would like to recommend the following:

● To provide indicators and criteria to apply governance in schools within the eastern region in order to identify strengths, reinforce points of weakness, and issue indicators of governance standards for schools of the gifted in the Kingdom.

● To put in place mechanisms for effective monitoring of procedures and regulation policies that support implementation to achieve quality in gifted programmes, and to disseminate awareness associated with laws, legislation, and programming systems among all employees working in gifted care.

Acknowledgment

References

Abu Nasser, Fathi &Jugheiman, Abdulla. (2012). The reality of educational policies associated with the gifted in Saudi Arabia. Jordanian Journal for Educational Sciences, 8 (3), 195-213.

Albani, Reem. (2020). the objectives of care programs of the gifted at the elementary level from the perspective of education supervisors and female teachers in Riyadh. Journal of College of Education, Azhar University, 185 (2), 541-505.

Alfi, Ashraf & Al-Harthi, Abdul Aziz. (2019). Management transparency of elementary school leaders at Taif governorate and its relation to school ambience from the perspective of teachers. Journal of Education, Sohaj University, 67 (3), 235-286.

Alqahtani, R &Kallapen, N. (2020). Quality assurance in gifted education. Universal Journal Educational research, 8 (11), 5137-5150.

Alshaer, et al., (2017). Governance of public universities and their role in promoting partnership with non-governmental institutions. International Journal of Engineering and Information Systems, 1 (9), 214-238.

Raee, Asma. Actual application of electronic governance in Jordanian public universities and its relation to management empowering of teaching staff members from their own perspective. (Unpublished M.A thesis). Amman, Jordan: Middle East University.

Arab Organization for Education, Culture, and Sciences. (2013). A study on patterns of governance of Education systems and their impact on managing educational institutions to secure service quality. Arab observatory for Education, Education Department.

Areeni, Manal. (2014). Actual application of governance from the perspective of administrative and academic bodies employed by ImanMohhammed ibn Saud University. International Education, 3 (12), 114-148.

Aseeri, Kholoud. (2017). Governance reality of prince Sattam bin Abdul Aziz university from 2030 vision of the kingdom from the perspective of their administrative and academic leaderships. (Unpublished M.A thesis). Kharj: University of prince Sattam.

Azmi, Abdulla. (2016). Education: A governance for special national change in the ministry for high quality outcomes. Alweeam Electronic Journal, available at /http://www.alweeam.com.sa

Bashir, Mohammed. (2019). Basics and principles of governance theory and requirements of application in public education in the Sudan. Journal of Educational and Psychological sciences, 3 (16), 27-45

Buqami, Mariam. (2021). Governance from the perspective of administration in Islam. Dirasat Journal in Humanities. Center for Research and Developing Human Resources, Rimah, 4 (1).

Fawwaz, Najwa. (2015). Actual application of good governance principles in universities of Mecca area from the perspective of academic leaderships: A proposal. (Unpublished Dissertation). Umm Al-Qura University, faculty of Education.

Jaraydeh, Mohammed. (2020). A proposed model for applying management transparency in public institutions of education. Journal of Ammar Thuleiji Al-Aghwat, Algeria, (88), 68-86.

Jugheiban, Abdulla. (1428 AH). The gifted care program at schools of public education Riyadh: Ministry of Education.

Kadier, A. (2019). Good governance issues in education system and management of secondary schools in Kawara State, Nigeria. http://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/Ej1234494.pdf.

Khatib, Jamal & Al-Hadeedi, Mona. (2009). Introduction to special education. Amman: Dar Al-Fikr for publishing and distribution volume, (1).

King Abdul Aziz Foundation for the Gifted and Creative. Riyadh, www.mawhiba.org.

Mahmoud, Jamal. (2016). The degree of applying governance principles and its relation to quality of work procedures at education directorates in northern governorates of the West Bank from the perspective of secondary school principals (Unpublish M.A thesis). Najah National University, Faculty of Higher education. Misk Foundation for Gifted care. Riyadh, www.misk.org.sa

Mohammadi, Samira. (2019). The degree of applying governance standards at private schools in Tabuk in light of Kingdom's 2030 vision. Journal of Educational sciences, 31 (2), 363-387.

Muntashiri, Abdulla. (2008). Quality requirements fot gifted care programs in Saudi Arabi. Paper presented at 14th symposium of Saudi society for educational, psychological, and social sciences: Quality of Teaching. Qasim: King Khalid Civilization Center.

Nushan, Munira. (2016). The reality of governance application at prince Noura Bint Abdul Rahman University. (Unpublished M.A thesis). Islamic University of ImanMohammed, department of educational planning.

Obeidat, Thouqan, Adas, Abdul Rahman &Kayed, Abdul Haq. (1996). Scientific research: concepts, tools, methods. Amman: Dark Al-Fiker, Volume (5).

Qurashi, Abdulla. (2020). Governance of educational management from the perspective of Kingdom 2030 vision. Journal of Anthropology and Society, 9 (5), 221-272.

Qufazi, Abdulla. (2021). The contribution of social service to gifted students' care in Saudi Arabia: A descriptive study applied to schools of Riyadh. Journal of Social Service and Humanities, 53 (3), 647-684

Raddadi, Hasan, et al., (2012). Assessing outcomes of gifted programs at Madina AL-Munawarah. Journal of Arabic Studies in Educational and Psychology, 3 (31), 236-298.

Rowdan, Raghad. (2021). The reality of governance at college of education in Qasim university in light of kingdom's 2030 vision. International Journal for Educational and Psychological Studies, 9 (2), 653-676.

Sawadi, Aqel. (2015). Good governance as a way for guaranteeing quality and academic accreditation in Saudi universities. (Unpublished Dissertation). Umm Al-Qura university, Faculty of Education.

Shaftoe, R. (2021). Corporate governance. Chron Newsletter, 9.

Shammari, Khalid. (2021). Availability of governing standards requirements at Hafer Al-Baten , university in light of institutional accreditation by educational bodies in Saudi Arabia, Turaba branch. Journal of Education and Humanities, (15),461 – 491.

Shawish, Ali. (2021). The extent of applying principles of governance at Ib university from the perspective of teaching staff members. Journal of Arts for Educational Psychological Studies, (10), 7-55.

Tawfik, Abdul Rahman &Qurashi, Layla. (2006). we are all creative, but. Cairo: Management Professional Expertise Center, volume (1).

Zatmi, Mohammed &Walkehd, Lakhadir. (2020). the extent of application of governance principles by U.N.R.W.A school management in Gaza governorates and methods of activation. Journal of Psychological and Educational Sciences 6 (1), 14-34.