

Pre-service Teachers Women attitudes to moral intelligence
Actitudes de las profesoras ante la inteligencia moral

Avital HECHT¹
Ilana LEVENBERG²

Received	: 18.04.2024
Approved	: 21.06.2024
Published	: 30.06.2024

ABSTRACT: Moral intelligence involves cognitive, emotional and social abilities that guide the individual on how to behave ethically in accordance with personal and societal values. Moral behavior is important in any society, certainly among educators who guide future generations. In the current pilot study, 84 exceptional females, Pre-service teachers answered an attitude questionnaire based on four components of moral intelligence: responsibility, compassion, forgiveness and integrity. Almost everyone considered herself honest, forgiving and personally responsible. The findings of the study show that about 90% of the preservice teachers view themselves as responsible persons. This means that traditional gender roles didn't change. Women take full responsibility for their actions and mistakes even in the 21st century. Examining diverse populations of women and validating the credibility of their statements may further elucidate moral intelligence among female population.

KEYWORDS: Women Moral Intelligence, Values, Female responsibility, Pre-service teacher's women.

RESUMEN: La inteligencia moral implica capacidades cognitivas, emocionales y sociales que orientan al individuo sobre cómo comportarse éticamente de acuerdo con los valores personales y sociales. El comportamiento moral es importante en cualquier sociedad, sin duda entre los educadores que guían a las generaciones futuras. En el presente estudio piloto, 84 excepcionales profesoras en formación respondieron a un cuestionario de actitudes basado en cuatro componentes de la inteligencia moral: responsabilidad, compasión, perdón e integridad. Casi todas se consideraban íntegras, indulgentes y personalmente responsables. Las conclusiones del estudio muestran que cerca del 90% de las profesoras en prácticas se consideran personas responsables. Esto significa que los roles tradicionales de género no cambiaron. Las mujeres asumen toda la responsabilidad de sus actos y errores incluso en el siglo XXI. Examinar diversas poblaciones de mujeres y validar la credibilidad de sus declaraciones puede dilucidar aún más la inteligencia moral entre la población femenina.

PALABRAS CLAVE: Inteligencia moral femenina, Valores, Responsabilidad Femenina, Mujeres docentes en formación

HOW TO CITE:

Hecht, A. and Levenberg, I. (2024). Pre-service Teachers Women attitudes to moral intelligence. *Mujer y Políticas Públicas*, 3(1), 268-289. <https://doi.org/10.31381/mpp.v3i1.6670>

¹ Gordon Academic College of Education, Haifa, Israel, Hechtavital@gordon.ac.il, ORCID: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-3771-0711>

² Gordon Academic College of Education, Haifa, Israel, Ilanalev@gordon.ac.il, ORCID <https://orcid.org/0009-0007-1334-1022>

INTRODUCTION

Human morality has been of interest to mankind since Plato and later his student Aristotle studied the topic, with the claim that human beings can manage their behavior according to values and feelings familiar to them, as they function within the framework of their family and society. However, not only the ancient Greeks were preoccupied with the roots of morality. Indian and Chinese philosophers discussed the human aspiration for justice and self-restraint as qualities that improve the feelings of human functioning in a given society (Engelbrecht and Hendrikz, 2020). This engagement continued to develop along with humanity, evident in philosophy and psychology throughout the history of human thought and even today. Even in the Bible and the Holy Scriptures we find extensive reference to man's moral dimension as a value basis for the direction of the human community. According to Clarken (2010) the development of moral intelligence is considered a main objective of life in many societies throughout the history of mankind. Later, with the development and establishment of the monotheistic religions, morality was linked to religious belief and worship, but the practice of morality and encouraging the cultivation of moral intelligence was again included in the norms important to the human race and the quality of human society. The concept of intelligence is typically a source of admiration in advanced societies, especially when connected to a material and individualistic world rather than those types that focus on the values of justice and morality (Clarken, 2010).

Moral intelligence helps instill and apply ethical values in the field in one's personal goals, actions world of values. Moral intelligence can be attributed a special status among the various types of intelligence, as it includes cognitive, emotional and social abilities that guide a person to behave in accordance with his personal values and those principles that guide his environment. It involves the ability to apply moral principles within the framework of goals, values and actions, and embodies the human skills to differentiate between right and wrong while behaving ethically. Moral intelligence combines knowledge, willpower and passion; in fact, it is the way a person thinks, feels and acts (Clarken, 2009). Considering the above and the importance of the concept of "moral intelligence" specifically among educators, this study examined the attitudes of this particular population towards the four components of moral intelligence: responsibility, compassion, forgiveness and integrity.

Literature Review

Intelligence is the human ability to reason, think, understand, and remember as a basis for learning, memory, perception, and decision. Some of these are innate while others can be developed and nurtured.

Humans possess different types of intelligence that can be attributed to a combination of innate, genetic, and acquired traits (Beheshtifar et al., 2011). Moral intelligence is a new field that is less researched than other types of intelligence in the cognitive, social, and emotional fields, though it has disciplinary potential to improve the understanding of human behavior and its study. It concerns the ability to impose principles of ethics in the framework of an individual's goals, values, and actions (Clarcken, 2009). This ability is based on indicators that a person possesses for evaluating his own actions as well as those of his associates. Moral intelligence is also expressed in different contexts and situations and cultures, while interacting with the other types of intelligences as defined by Gardner (1983) who proposed an innovative approach in understanding the concept of intelligence.

Gardner introduced the multiple intelligence theory (Brualdi Timmins, 1996) according to which "Intelligence is the ability to solve problems or design products that are recognized as important in a given socio-cultural framework" (Gardner, 1983). He defined eight types of intelligences: **linguistic, mathematical (logical), spatial, musical, physical (movement), intrapersonal, interpersonal, and naturalistic** and argued that these are autonomous and cannot be measured quantitatively by the traditional means of measuring intelligence (Gardner, 1983). Gardner added that there is a basis - both biological and cultural - for those multiple intelligences and that the cultural component is a decisive factor in their development process (Brualdi Timmins, 1996). Just as emotional intelligence is different from cognitive intelligence, moral intelligence is a different type of intelligence (Beheshtifar et al., 2011).

Later on, Gardner questioned whether moral intelligence actually existed when he re-examined the relevance of the theory, he had developed himself, and even questioned his early assumptions (Gardner, 1999). At the same time, he maintained that the world of intelligence is limited and that issues that are indeed important such as personality, motivation, desire, attention, character, creativity and other valuable human skills should not be included in its scope without defining

them as intelligence or at least part of it (Gardner, 1993). Unable to pinpoint its essence, Gardner concluded that moral intelligence cannot be defined as one of man's intelligences in the 21st century, but he did determine that people with the same moral value components will demonstrate them through four strengths: the ability to identify issues concerning the sanctity of life, identification of situations concerning the exploitation of spiritual leadership; personal empowerment that enables coping with sensitive situations, and the potential to lead thinking that goes beyond the social conventions of a given community (Gardner, 1999).

Lennick and Kiel (2005) defined moral intelligence as the mental ability of people to understand how to implement universal values in everyday life and within the framework of their beliefs, characterizing those principles of ethics or morality as cross-cultural values. In their book (Lennick and Kiel, 2005) they introduced a measurement tool, the "Moral Competency Index" (MCI) based on four values: responsibility, integrity, forgiveness, and compassion. Their intention was to help people identify strengths within a moral framework through the MCI and subsequently strengthen them; this would enable identification of specific moral values that need bolstering in any given individual. This process may be beneficial in consolidating leadership qualities; organizations may utilize the index to identify employees with leadership potential (Martin and Austin, 2010).

Moral intelligence is a tool for human development on two complementary levels: the individual's inner happiness as well as his/her achievement of fraternal happiness towards the human environment, through betterment of one's moral personality (Díaz Torres and Rodríguez Gómez, 2008). Borba (2005) chose to refer to moral intelligence as the human ability to distinguish between good and bad, while adhering to a powerful moral compass that determines one's behavior. A person's knowledge, willpower and choices are important elements in the formation of his/her moral intelligence (Al-Adamat et al., 2020). To this, Clarcken (2009) adds additional elements of the way in which a person thinks, feels, and acts as part of his moral intelligence.

Borba detailed seven key concepts that must be cultivated in children to consolidate moral intelligence: conscience, empathy, respect, self-control, fairness, kindness and tolerance (Borba, 2001). Later, Linick and Kyle determined those four principles necessary to establish measurement of moral intelligence that have already been presented here: integrity, responsibility, compassion and forgiveness (Al-Adamat et al., 2020).

In a later study, Clarcken added a breakdown of the components of each of those four principals. For the term integrity they detailed four components: behavior in accordance with values and beliefs, speaking the truth, defending justice and keeping promises. For responsibility they included three components: taking personal responsibility, taking ownership of mistakes, and taking personal responsibility in order to serve others. The principle of forgiveness was presented as having two components: overcoming personal mistakes and displaying understanding for the mistakes of others. Lastly, compassion was defined as a demonstration of concern and consideration for the other (Clarcken, 2009). Rahimi (2011) combined the elements and main points of moral intelligence presented in the studies that preceded him and created a new model of seven key characteristics for the moral being: inhibitory control, empathy, consistency, fairness, responsibility, cooperation and logic. This model proffers a relationship between the degree of expression of these qualities and the level of that person's moral intelligence (Rahimi, 2011). The purpose of moral intelligence is to assure functionality in the interaction between the person and his environment (Belohlavek, 2007, as cited on Beheshtifar et al., 2011).

We are witness to the connections made by researchers between the various elements of moral intelligence and the main points that they identified as composing those elements. All believed in the correlation between the level of emotional intelligence and the value of responsibility, so that a person with a high level of emotional intelligence will demonstrate an elevated sense of responsibility (Al-Adamat et al., 2020). Keeping in mind that responsibility is the ability to bear the consequences of one's actions, including one's mistakes, the dimension of responsibility thus includes self-control and respect. Therefore, the components of compassion, empathy and kindness correlate to those characteristics found in levels of moral intelligence (Rahimi, 2011; Borba, 2001). The value of forgiveness mentioned by Lennick and Kiel (2005) is of course related to the virtue of patience detailed by Borba (2001), since the principle of forgiveness requires accepting the mistakes of others.

Moral intelligence is the human ability to behave based on universal values (Lennick and Kiel, 2005). If this is true, then morality is a priority and people are endowed with innate qualities of integrity, responsibility, compassion, and forgiveness. The MCI measures these traits in the individual in order to determine his level of moral intelligence (Martin and Austin, 2010). One's personal moral compass is based on the internal beliefs and values that guide that person's thoughts

and actions, without the influence of demographic elements such as religion, gender, ethnicity, culture or nationality (Lennick and Kiel, 2005). This study will define those values for the purpose of analyzing and examining them within the framework of the MCI index:

Responsibility is the person's ability to admit his mistakes and bear the consequences of his actions, despite the expected results of his behavior. Thus the person chooses to bear the results of his actions while understanding that they have consequences. This is true for all areas of human activity - personal, social, environmental, and organizational (Al-Adamat et al., 2020).

Compassion has been defined as the active demonstration of concern and attention towards others (Clarcken, 2009). The person will show empathy towards another individual in sensitive situations, even if it is unnecessary (Husseini et al., 2013, as cited on Al-Adamat et al., 2020).

Forgiveness reflects the human quality of accepting and understanding that people sometimes err in their actions. A person who is unable to learn to accept human flaws and the mistakes of others becomes rigid and uncompromising, thus negatively affecting and harming the common good (Manallack, 2006, as cited on Al-Adamat et al., 2020). It is also important that a person be able to overcome his own mistakes just as he knows how to forgive others for theirs, so that society can function while managing different attitudes and behaviors through discourse and understanding.

Integrity reflects the harmony between a person's beliefs and actions (Manallack, 2006, as cited on Al-Adamat et al., 2020). The intention is to act in a way that will bring about positive results and serve the common good (Husseini et al., 2013, as cited on Al-Adamat et al., 2020). Integrity involves behaving in accordance with personal principles, values and beliefs, fairness, doing the right thing and keeping promises (Clarcken, 2010).

Clarcken even suggests considering the three elements that Robert Sternberg (2000) included in his definition of love - passion, intimacy, and commitment, as part of moral intelligence in the emotional arena (Clarcken, 2009).

Certain researchers attribute the roots of moral intelligence to the days of ancient Greece when philosophers and intellectuals conducted discourse on the topic in the public arena (Arif et al., 2019). They also point out that the three monotheistic religions - Judaism, Christianity and Islam, are based on the core values of moral intelligence as formulated by Lennick and Kiel. Upon analyzing the effect of religious belief in the field of moral intelligence, these researchers

determined that this is a human aspiration transcending nations and countries, and that those with moral intelligence feel comfortable and proud to serve others. They also determined that these people never feel lonely nor are they easily angered during their lives. According to the researchers, human societies that underestimate or do not attribute importance to moral intelligence are prone to develop social evils such as corruption, intolerance and lack of respect (Arif et al., 2019).

Moral intelligence in the field of education

The need to cultivate moral intelligence originated in the business world, but the question arises, how can the business world be separated from education and the school environment? After all, the platform of human behavior is rooted in education, and therefore, when we seek to analyze the sources of moral intelligence, we must devote our thinking and understanding to the educational arena.

The original tendency in the cultivation of this type of intelligence attributes morality to religious domains, which a secular and democratic society prefers to distance from school settings, as in the United States, based on the first amendment to the constitution. At the same time, educators clearly have a moral role to create a just and caring environment and to serve as moral role models that will be a source of inspiration for their students. This is also true for professors towards the students and for leaders toward their citizens (Clarcken, 2009); moral intelligence is closely related to leadership efficacy (Bass and Steidmeier, 1999).

With the many changes taking place in modern society, the required investment in educating toward values, as noted by Díaz Torres and Rodríguez Gómez (2008), originates from society's need to produce educators and students with ethical answers and strategies on both a personal and social level. The researchers emphasized the centrality of values in the educational framework that would consolidate ways to form a moral personality; thus, the quality of education is apparently determined according to the honesty, depth and influence of the values that an educator inspires and instills in his students (Díaz Torres and Rodríguez Gómez, 2008).

The educational and social environment as contributing factors to the formation of moral intelligence

Educating towards values and morals aspires to inculcate values in the children who represent the objective of the education process as a framework for consolidating the formation of their cognition, emotions and willfulness, while their personalities strengthen and mature. Therefore, it is essential to create the optimal environmental conditions in accordance with the characteristics of the specific society. This necessitates the combination of personal desires, duties towards society, and internalization of the world of human and civil rights alongside the integration of the individual into everyday life (Díaz Torres and Rodríguez Gómez, 2008).

In 1988, the Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development (ASCD) recommended moral education as an empowering and unifying factor within the school curriculum and encouraged educators to create social and cultural frameworks designed to support the development of ‘morally mature’ people to whom educators may devote extra attention regarding moral education (Clarcken, 2009).

Education affects human development both on the individual level and in the shared environment; the classroom is therefore a framework of central moral significance and a stage from which the student will join society in future occurrences. In the classroom, an understanding is formed of values such as humanity, uniqueness and difference, open-mindedness, understanding, tolerance, honesty, courage, wisdom, reliability and caring. The classroom acts as a stage for the creation, growth and practice of moral intelligence (Clarcken, 2009).

It is crucial to understand that educating towards values as a basis for forming moral behavior requires not only the teaching of values but also the personal example of educators, as they ensure the ability to function in a multicultural and diverse framework with the understanding and recognition that other and perhaps different people must be respected and allowed to express themselves. The first years of a person's life - when the child is surrounded by family and especially his parents, are the most influential factor in his cognitive, moral, social and emotional development. That, however, is not enough, and the role of educational institutions is to establish and continue to develop education with the aim of cultivating the moral intelligence of toddlers and children from an early age. The lack of moral education and personal example will cause the

children and youth to be influenced only by the media and the virtual world to which they are so often exposed (Clarcken, 2010).

At the heart of the cultivation of moral intelligence are basic values such as freedom, equality before the law, brotherhood, justice, respect, tolerance, and discourse. Therefore, it is important to understand that moral intelligence is a broad term and not limited to moral judgment, but rather to the individual's systemic and complex ability to combine a variety of tools. On a personal level are introspection, moral sensitivity, empathy, and self-control, while on the environmental level, intercultural discourse must be allowed, and even the creation of an educational environment allows for common values adapted to the characteristics of the social environment (Díaz Torres and Rodríguez Gómez, 2008).

Borba defined moral intelligence as the ability to distinguish between good and bad and adherence and belief in the values that guide a person to behave accordingly. She enumerated seven virtues necessary for cultivating moral intelligence in children: empathy, conscience, self-control, respect, kindness, tolerance and fairness (Borba, 2001). Interestingly, the qualities that Borba proposed for the children's educational framework are parallel to those presented by Lennick and Kiel in their different categories.

Educating towards moral values allows the development of personal values that serve as a basis for self-criticism and personal observation that will accompany a person throughout life. This is about internalizing values and not just the intellectual knowledge that they exist. One should not be satisfied with the natural moral qualities innate in a person; the child must be exposed to moral social habits and norms that will influence and shape their moral personality (Medina Cepero, 2001). Consolidation of a moral personality unites social, cultural and even political aspects. Open discourse must be allowed in the public space alongside encouraging the cultivation of moral intelligence (Ortega and Mínguez, 2001).

Therefore, rather than relying on the individual's innate qualities, we look to the education system for its decisive contribution to the formation and nurture of a person's moral intelligence. The child may know how to distinguish between right and wrong and even control his inner impulses, but these will not be enough to manage his future actions and dictate his behavior. The educational system takes on the role of developing moral values so that they may be assimilated and

subsequently translated into actions. This is the ASCD recommendation from 1988 (Clarcken, 2009).

Clarcken (2010) cites Borba (2005) in advocating that every educational system implements several ways to cultivate moral intelligence among its students. Among other things, she suggests nurturing awareness of the emotional language used, improving sensitivity to the other's feelings, and even taking care to empathize with the others' views. Teachers have the responsibility and work of creating a framework for moral growth, teaching skills designed to strengthen the conscience, and leading and cultivating discipline that distinguishes between good and bad. Teachers will serve as a model of self-control and restraint for their students and will inculcate the habit of 'thought preceding action'. The teacher's role to impart the concepts of respect, acceptance of authority, manners and courtesy within the classroom. Educators must show zero tolerance towards the students' evil behavior and encourage diversity as a tool to eradicate prejudice and stereotyped thinking and behavior (Clarcken, 2010). Holistic education must involve moral intelligence and its components in order to maximize the human potential inherent in each child and adolescent.

A study conducted in a Nigerian high school (Olusola and Ajayi, 2015) found that children who were taught self-discipline exhibited this in their daily behavior. The study showed a significant correlation between moral intelligence and the perception of inappropriate behavior during tests. Moral values are at the basis of human actions such as misbehavior during tests and copying other students' work. Borba (2001) also found a correlation between moral thinking and academic integrity. The researchers' conclusion was that implementing the seven moral values that comprise moral intelligence will help students to behave correctly, avoid temptations and choose the right path. The researchers also recommended introducing programs that educate toward values in the school, involving parents in developing the values, turning teachers and educators into students' mentors regarding moral behavior, and convincing the educators to understand that they are role models for the students. They concluded that inculcating moral intelligence among students would be the most effective antidote against immoral behavior during examinations (Olusola and Ajayi, 2015).

Another study that examined the moral intelligence of educators in Turkey according to the MCI index (Lennick and Kiel, 2005) found that female educators received a higher index in the areas of integrity and forgiveness than male educators and that the age of all the educators who participated in the study was a positive indicator in the dimensions of integrity, responsibility and compassion that were found (Torpak and Karakus, 2018).

A research study comparing the learning achievements of men and women in an academic institution revealed that female students had a higher level of integrity, compassion and responsibility than did male students. In contrast, the forgiveness index was higher for male students than for female students. Their results actually indicated that the elements of moral intelligence as determined in the MCI index had a positive effect on the academic results of the study participants (Arif et al., 2019).

In view of the importance of moral intelligence and all its components, there is justification for examining them among college students in teaching training. They will soon be entrusted with imparting moral values to future generations in our schools.

METHODOLOGY

The purpose of this preliminary study was to examine the attitudes of preservice teachers towards responsibility, compassion, forgiveness and integrity, the four components that Lennick and Kiel (2005) determined as comprising moral intelligence. The study population included 84 participants, all students in teacher training.

The education students were given an attitudes questionnaire, as Lennick and Kiel (2005) had in their study that examined the moral intelligence of businesspeople. The questionnaire was translated into Hebrew and adapted for the students; its content was validated by three experts in the field of education research, one of them an expert in behavioral psychology.

The questionnaire is composed of two parts, the first demographic characteristics including:

- 1) Gender: Since a significant percentage of those studying for teaching training are women, it was not important to examine the men's positions as well, as can be seen later in Table 1.
- 2) Education: In the study participants' college there are different groups of teaching trainees, those who already hold a bachelor's degree and are currently seeking only a teaching certificate and those who are studying for the bachelor's degree in education and teacher certification. The distribution in the current study is almost numerically balanced (table 1).
- 3) Religious affiliation: In the study participants' college there are two major religious sectors, the secular students who make up the large majority, and the religious students, about one-third of the student body.
- 4) Early integration into the education system: There are teachers-in-training who are already working in practice even before they finish their training. We felt it was important to identify those who are already working in the classroom and to identify their attitudes.

The second part is an attitudes questionnaire that includes 42 statements (Appendix 1). The questionnaire corresponded almost fully to that of Lennick and Kiel, adapted to the field of education.

The questionnaire included 10 statements on responsibility, 10 statements on compassion, 6 on forgiveness and 16 on integrity.

The respondents were asked to rate their answers according to a five-point Likert scale: 1- disagree, 2- partially agree, 3- no opinion, 4- agree, 5- strongly agree.

It is important to note that the number of statements on the topic of integrity is greater than the number of statements regarding the other components, due to the special importance we have attached to the issue of integrity among educators, though it should be noted that the original questionnaire distributed among businesspeople also emphasized integrity.

Data analysis

Part I, Demographic Characteristics: A statistical analysis was performed and the demographic characteristics of the studied population were presented.

Part 2 - Attitudes Questionnaire: A factor analysis was conducted for the questionnaire items according to the four components. and a test for statistical significance.

Due to the sample size, it was decided to consolidate the respondents' answers into only three grades, so that responses 1 (disagree) and 2 (partially agree) were combined, as were responses 4 (agree) and 5 (strongly agree). Response 3- no opinion, remained as is.

The research findings

The questionnaire was sent via college application to a large number of students in one college. Upon receiving positive responses from 84 students, we felt that we had a representative model of the student population of teachers-in-training for our pilot study.

Demographic findings

Table 1 shows responders by gender, stage of studies, religiosity and place of work characteristics:

Table 1

Demographic characteristics of the respondents

	N	%	
Gender	Female	81	97%
	Male	3	3%
Stage of studies	Studying for Bachelor's degree	40	%48
	Academic transition to teaching	44	%52
Religiosity	Secular	53	%63
	Religious	31	%37
Work in the educational system	Currently working in education	52	%60
	Currently not working in education	32	%40

Of the study population, 97% of respondents were female; this is a true representation of the gender difference in the college where all most of the students are women.

Concerning the differences in study tracks, about half of the respondents (48%) were studying for a bachelor's degree in education while the remainder already had a bachelor's degree and were currently studying toward a teaching certificate.

About 60% of the respondents were already working in practice in the educational system and were integrated into all facets of educational activity. And this, even before they finished their

teaching training. This phenomenon of beginning to work in an educational framework prior to completing teacher training has become common in recent years due to the lack of teachers in the entire education system, both primary and secondary.

RESULTS OF THE ATTITUDES QUESTIONNAIRE

Examining the entire study population together with respect to the attitudes questionnaire, solid and clear positions were found (see Appendix No. 1), and similarly, clear opposing positions were found in each of the four components of the questionnaire: responsibility, compassion, forgiveness, and integrity. All the respondents, almost overwhelmingly, in high percentages presented themselves very clearly as responsible, compassionate, and honest people, with a willingness to forgive.

For example, on the topic of integrity, over 95% answered in question 14, ("I treat people with respect not only for reasons of benefit"). Similarly, the respondents perceived themselves as being considered honest people by others (question 20 - 98.8% answered 'agree' and 'strongly agree'). They also responded that it is possible to educate others to take responsibility for actions (89.3% 'agree' and 'strongly agree') and pay heed to making moral decisions. Regarding forgiveness, although the percentage was not as high as the previous ones, 68% of the respondents still claimed to tend to forgive other people for mistakes, though they are unwilling to forgive those who hurt others.

Of the study respondents, 73% declared that they know and can define their moral values are, and to openly express a response to the inappropriate behavior of others (questions 19 and 22).

The study participants did have varied responses to question 23, about dishonesty. Interestingly, 38% were wary of commenting on the dishonesty of others; that is, they did not respond to the issue of dishonesty, out of caution.

The respondents were also divided on the subject of forgiveness for students' errors. Here too, 37% were unwilling to forgive their students for mistakes they make. Only 68% were willing to forgive

others in general for mistakes and maintained that forgiveness is learned and acquired rather than innate.

As mentioned, most of the respondents perceived themselves as able to keep information confidential, cooperate with others and treat others with respect. These and other statements were also examined with reference to the demographic differences.

Examining results of the attitudes questionnaire according to demographic differences was not relevant, because of the small number of men.

In table 2 we'll appreciate a comparison between the four components of Moral Intelligence:

Table 2

Comparison by course of study of the mean and SD, of the four components of moral intelligence

Group Statistics					
	Study track	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Responsibility	Bachelor's degree	40	2.3325	.27022	.04273
	Academic retraining	44	2.2705	.36509	.05504
Compassion	Bachelor's degree	40	2.4675	.29646	.04688
	Academic retraining	44	2.5682	.32691	.04928
Forgiveness	Bachelor's degree	40	2.4042	.30403	.04807
	Academic retraining	44	2.4394	.32368	.04880
Integrity	Bachelor's degree	40	2.5469	.21076	.03332
	Academic retraining	44	2.6179	.22844	.03444

From the mean values it is apparent that no differences were found according to the study tracks, in the respondents' answers to all four components. The standard deviation is almost uniform for all variables.

Table 3 shows us the four components in secular and religious students:

Table 3

Comparison between religious and secular, mean and SD, of the four components of moral intelligence

		Group Statistics			
	Religiosity	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Responsibility	Secular	53	2.3094	.34265	.04707
	Religious	31	2.2839	.29109	.05228
Compassion	Secular	53	2.4887	.35877	.04928
	Religious	31	2.5742	.21597	.03879
Forgiveness	Secular	53	2.4371	.29819	.04096
	Religious	31	2.3978	.34069	.06119
Integrity	Secular	53	2.6002	.22712	.03120
	Religious	31	2.5565	.21308	.03827

From the mean values it is apparent that no differences were found according to religious or secular affiliation, in the respondents' answers to the four components.

In table 4 there is a comparison of the four components in respondents' answers by their work status:

Table 4

Comparison between currently working/not working in the educational system, mean and SD, of the four components of moral intelligence

		Group Statistics			
	Currently working in the educational system	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Responsibility	Yes	51	2.3098	.34249	.04796
	No	33	2.2848	.29487	.05133
Compassion	Yes	51	2.5137	.34987	.04899
	No	33	2.5303	.25676	.04470
Forgiveness	Yes	51	2.4444	.30852	.04320
	No	33	2.3889	.32185	.05603
Integrity	Yes	51	2.5686	.22124	.03098
	No	33	2.6080	.22386	.03897

From the mean values it is apparent that no differences were found between those already employed in the educational system and those who have not yet been assigned to such work, in the respondents' answers to the four components.

t-test for statistical significance

Since no differences were found in the mean values, t-tests were also conducted to further clarify any possible variations. No clear significant difference was found.

In conclusion, the findings of the study present the almost uniform perception of all those surveyed regarding central issues in moral intelligence: responsibility, compassion, forgiveness and integrity.

DISCUSSION

This novel/preliminary study aimed to examine the attitude of preservice teachers, regarding the main components of moral intelligence. From their responses, an almost uniform result emerges, showing a high level of moral perception regarding all four components - responsibility, forgiveness, compassion, and integrity. In a comparative examination between the values, more fundamental differences emerge within the analysis of the 'forgiveness' value. The value of forgiveness is an acquired value, therefore it is expected to change during teacher training and practice, as the educator acquires professional experience in the field.

This homogeneous perception of all the respondents toward the components of moral intelligence reinforces the assumption that it is possible to identify in preservice teachers, those already working in the teaching profession and those still in training who have not yet begun to practice teaching, a cohesive and even solid moral value orientation around the four variables tested. The fact that no significant differences were found between the respondents, being all of them women, is not surprising. Therefore, we conclude that the professional field that a person who intends to engage in teaching will choose for his training, will not affect the extent of his adherence to these values. Also, we found no differences in the lifestyle component regarding the respondents' degree of religiosity, even though there were both secular and religious study participants, and members of different religions.

CONCLUSIONS

The findings of this study, that the population were mostly women, should be done again in order to compare man a women attitude to the same four components and this in order to check and support the research findings of Torpak and Karakus (2018) and Arif et al. (2019), who found significant differences between women's and men's attitudes for the same four elements that were examined in this study.

Since moral intelligence holds a unique status among all the types of intelligence as a combination of cognitive, emotional, and social abilities, it is possible that the moral intelligence of the education students is affected by their very choice of education as their professional field. At the same time, a limitation of this study is the possibility that some of the respondents were aware of the need to present themselves as people with a high moral level and that their answers may have been, at least partially, influenced by social desirability, that is, their desire to fulfill social expectations (McCabe, 2005).

BIBLIOGRAPHIC REFERENCES

- Al-Adamat, A., Al-Gasawneh, J. and Al-Adamat, O. (2020). The impact of moral intelligence on green purchase intention. *Management Science Letters*, 10(9), 2063-2070. https://www.growingscience.com/msl/Vol10/msl_2020_24.pdf
- Arif, A. H., Din, M. and Saleem, Z. (2019). Exploring gender differences in moral intelligence and its effects on the learning outcomes of second year college students. *Global Regional Review*, IV(III), 360-366. [https://doi.org/10.31703/grr.2019\(IV-III\).40](https://doi.org/10.31703/grr.2019(IV-III).40)
- Bass, B. M. and Steidlmeier, P. (1999). Ethics, character, and authentic transformational leadership behavior. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 10(2), 181-217. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843\(99\)00016-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/S1048-9843(99)00016-8)
- Beheshtifar, M., Esmaeli, Z. and Nekoie Mohadam, M. (2011). Effect of moral intelligence on leadership. *European Journal of Economics, Finance and Administrative Sciences*, 43(1), 6-11.

- Borba, M. (2001). *Building moral intelligence The Seven Essential Virtues that Teach Kids to Do the Right Thing*. Jossey Bass.
- Borba, M. (2005). The step-by-step plan to building moral intelligence. In M. Dent (Ed.), *Nurturing kids' heart & souls: Building emotional, social and spiritual competency* (pp. 17-23). Jossey-Bass.
- Brualdi Timmins, A. C. (1996). Multiple intelligences: Gardner's theory. *Practical Assessment, Research, and Evaluation*, 5(1).
- Clarcken, R. H. (2009). *Moral Intelligence in the Schools*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the Michigan Academy of Sciences, Arts and Letters, Wayne State University, Detroit, MI. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED508485.pdf>
- Clarcken, R. H. (2010). *Considering Moral Intelligence as Part of a Holistic Education*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Denver, CO. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/ED509643.pdf>
- Díaz Torres, J. M. and Rodríguez Gómez, J. M. (2008). La educación en valores como estrategia de desarrollo y consolidación de la persona moral. *Estudios Sobre Educación*, 15, 159-169. <https://doi.org/10.15581/004.15.23441>
- Engelbrecht, A. and Hendrikz, K. (2020). Influence of moral intelligence, principled leadership and trust on organisational citizenship behaviour. *South African Journal of Economic and Management Sciences*, 23(1). <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajems.v23i1.3429>
- Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences*. Basic Books.
- Gardner, H. (1993). The relationship between early giftedness and later achievement. In G. R. Bock and K. Ackrill (Ed.). *The origins and development of high ability* (pp. 175-186). John Wiley & Sons.
- Gardner, H. (1999). *Intelligence reframed. Multiple intelligences for the 21st century*. Basic Books.
- Lennick, D. and Kiel, F. (2005). *Moral intelligence: Enhancing business performance & leadership success*. Pearson Education.
- Martin, D. E. and Austin, B. (2010). Validation of the moral competency inventory measurement instrument: Content, construct, convergent and discriminant approaches. *Management Research Review*, 33(5), 437-451. <https://doi.org/10.1108/01409171011041884>
- How to cite: Hecht, A. and Levenberg, I. (2024). Pre-service Teachers Women attitudes to moral intelligence. *Mujer y Políticas Públicas*, 3(1), 268-289. <https://doi.org/10.31381/mpp.v3i1.6670>

Medina Cepero, J. R. (2001). *Sistemas contemporáneos de educación moral*. Ariel.

McCabe, D. L. (2005). Cheating among college and university students: A North American perspective. *International Journal of Educational Integrity*, 1(1). <https://doi.org/10.21913/IJEI.v1i1.14>

Olusola, O. I. and Ajayi, O. S. (2015). Moral intelligence: An antidote to examination malpractices in Nigerian schools. *Universal Journal of Educational Research*, 3(2), 32-38. <https://eric.ed.gov/?id=EJ1053974>

Ortega, P. Y. and Mínguez, R. (2001). *La educación moral del ciudadano de hoy*. Ediciones Paidós.

Rahimi, G. R. (2011). The implication of moral intelligence and effectiveness in organization: Are they interrelated? *International Journals of Marketing and Technology*, 1(4), 67-76.

Sternberg, R. J. (2000). *Handbook of human intelligence*. Cambridge University Press.

Torpak, M. and Karakus, M. (2018). Teachers' moral intelligence: A scale adaptation into Turkish and preliminary evidence. *European Journal of Educational Research*, 7(4), 901-911. <https://doi.org/10.12973/eu-jer.7.4.901>

Appendix 1

Statement	Responses in percentages (%)		
	Do not agree/ Partially agree	I have no opinion	Agree/ Agree absolutely
1. Everyone must ignore their mistakes	94	2.4	3.6
2. Students must be forgiven for their errors	36.9	10.7	52.4
3. Each person must take responsibility for his mistakes	7.1	-	92.9
4. I admit wrong decisions to my superiors	25	11.9	63.1
5. I always help my students	8.3	4.8	86.9
6. I give negative criticism to my students in a respectful manner	27.4	13.1	59.5
7. I see my mistakes as leverage for personal advancement	14.3	7.1	78.6

8. I have a realistic approach to everything that happens to me	6.0	2.4	91.7
9. I show full understanding for students' errors	14.3	11.9	73.8
10. I am considered a person who cooperates with my teammates at work	4.8	1.2	94
11. My teammates will testify that I can be trusted	1.2	1.2	97.6
12. If they ask me to keep a secret, I always keep my promise	1.2	3.6	95.2
13. I also trust people who have made mistakes	26.2	17.9	56
14. I treat people with respect not only for reasons of benefit	2.4	2.4	95.2
15. I always keep my promises to my co-workers	7.1	6	86.9
16. I always learn from my mistakes	15.5	4.8	79.8
17. My behavior is always predictable	32.1	25	42.9
18. I am not always consistent in my opinions	63.1	16.7	20.2
19. I am able to define what the moral values of educators are	13.1	13.1	73.8
20. I am considered an honest person by others	1.2	-	98.8
21. Part of my role in life is also to serve others	10.7	7.1	82.1
22. I will always respond to inappropriate behavior proportionately	19	15.5	65.5
23. I am careful not to comment on the dishonesty of others	45.2	16.7	38.1
24. If things go wrong I will also blame others for it	69	19	11.9
25. I protest against discrimination against others	25	9.5	65.5
26. I consult with others in important decisions	8.3	2.4	89.3
27. I always check if my decisions are moral	9.5	4.8	85.7
28. Forgiving others enriches me a lot too	6.0	9.5	84.5
29. Only if the situation allows I break promises	58.3	28.6	13.1
30. I always protest what I think is injustice	29.8	11.9	58.3
31. I am always attentive to my students	6.0	2.4	91.7

32. I show interest even in people who are strangers to me	25	4.8	70.2
33. I always confess my failures to my friends	47.6	11.9	40.5
34. I tend to forgive people for mistakes	26.2	6	67.9
35. Hurting others cannot be forgiven	77.4	9.5	13.1
36. Sensitivity to justice is an innate quality	44	15.5	40.5
37. Students can be taught to be sensitive to others	11.9	1.2	86.9
38. Forgiveness is one of the skills a person is born with	53.6	29.8	16.7
39. It is not possible to educate to take responsibility for actions	89.3	4.8	6.0
40. Compassion is part of human nature	29.8	9.5	60.7
41. Responsibility depends on a person's level of intelligence	52.4	16.7	31
42. A person cannot be taught to forgive	91.7	7.1	7.2