

# Moral Intelligence and Sustainable Consumption: A Field Research on Young Consumers

**Ibrahim Bozaci**

Kirikkale University, Keskin Vocational High School, 71800, Kirşehir Road, 3. km, Kirikkale,  
TURKEY

Email: iborganizer@gmail.com

DOI: 10.6007/IJARBSS/v4-i11/1313 URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v4-i11/1313>

## **Abstract**

Moral intelligence has been evaluated as a new form of intelligence and taken attention the scientists recently, which is thought as an extension of multiple intelligence approach. At this point, the role of the moral intelligence on consumer behavior has not been researched. This study is conducted to scrutinize possible relationships between moral intelligence and sustainable consumption behavior. Initial data are collected from students of Keskin Vocational High School of Kirikkale University by survey method. Descriptive analyses are conducted. Results indicate that moral intelligence is closely related with sustainable consumption behavior styles. By this way one possible psychological determinant of sustainable consumption is pointed out. Suggestions for firms and researches are made at last.

**Key Words:** Consumption, Moral Intelligence, Intelligence, Sustainable Consumption, Consumption and Morality

**Jel Codes:** D120, M310, M39

## **1. Introduction**

Recently it is argued that ethical behavior and decision making is result of moral intelligence, which is a current issue that is struggled to be pointed out and measured. At this point the results of moral intelligence in consumer behaviors have not been taken attention. So relationships between moral intelligence and specific consumption behavior (consumption styles like sustainable consumption etc.) should be investigated for better understanding of consumer behavior. Ethical decision making is a current investigation area in business life. But the subject has been taken from the managers' point of view because of unethical activities of managers. Firms, managers or employees can overview ethical decision making to reach short run objectives. Researches have been tried to discuss and show the results (economic crises, business failures etc.) of unethical behavior and decisions. On the other hand the issue has not been taken similar attention from the viewpoint of consumers.

## **2. Intelligence and Multiple Intelligences**

Traditionally, intelligence is used to be explained as a kind of cognitive ability especially for thinking, learning and using mathematical terms (Stenberg, 1990). But this approach has begun to change with Gardner's multiple intelligence approach. With this viewpoint, intelligence is considered as a subject that has verbal, visual, mathematical, musical, inter

personal, inner, social, emotional, spiritual and ethical dimensions (Gardner, 1998). This perspective has widely accepted in the field of education since it doesn't make a definition of incurable bad student and each student may have a different intelligence that can be dealt with and developed (Aborn, 2006; 83). Although Gardner hadn't considered moral intelligence as an important part of intelligence in his early studies, he attracted much attention in later studies (Clarken, 2010: 3, 7).

According to multiple intelligence approach, verbal intelligence consists of persuasion, speaking and using words effectively. And musical intelligence is the ability of memorizing songs and melodies and changing rhythm and tempo. Visual intelligence is considered as the sensitivity to shape, space, color and lines. Moreover physical intelligence is the ability of using body for opinion and emotion expression. Furthermore, interpersonal intelligence is known as understanding and solving emotions, spiritual conditions and problems of others. What is more, recognizing strengths and weaknesses of individual, understanding mood and wishes, seeing diversities and similarities and controlling emotions is known as inner intelligence. At this approach, although moral intelligence is not specified as a type of intelligence, existence of it has been started to be discussed in the multiple intelligence approach. To be able to live with many different people, evaluating ethics and intelligence within the same context has been emphasized (Altan, 2011: 53-54).

### **3. Moral Intelligence**

Gardner and others hesitated on defining moral intelligence since gathering people around a unified moral definition and values. But it is possible to determine universal moral codes. All over the world extortion of rights and lying is considered as immoral. And believing democracy, freedom of religion, preference and voice, priority of law and respecting basic human rights is considered as moral. On the other hand, since there are many intelligent people who cause to extinction, suffering, starvation, social and economic crises; the importance of moral intelligence will increase (Altan, 2011: 55).

Moral intelligence is the competence of applying moral principles to individual goals, values and behaviors. Developing moral intelligence would result to more healthy and positive individuals and social systems. Moreover, it is accepted as an important goal of people in religion systems as a responsibility. But in modern societies, materialistic and individualistic values are given more importance, with respect to moral ideals like truth, love or fairness. But the negative results of not giving enough importance to moral values are seen in the current economic, ecologic and political crises (Clarken, 2010: 1-2).

Moral and social intelligence is related with thinking, dealing with and liking others and considering the results of behaviors (Steiner, 2000: 64). Although the subject of moral intelligence has been studied less with respect to cognitive, emotional and social intelligences, it has an important potential to understand behavior and learning. People, leaders and teachers who are intelligent in terms of morality, affect social development by transferring these qualities to others (Clarken, 2009: 1-9).

Hogan (1973) explains moral intelligence with the traits of socializing, empathy and autonomy (Hogan, 1973). Haas (1998) defines moral intelligence as the ability of behaving ethically or capacity of depending behavior to ethics. Morally competent behaviors; has features like being emphatic, taking responsibility of others, self actualization and self control.

But the borders of moral character, moral thinking and moral behavior are not so clear (Hass, 1998).

According to Hogan's approach, moral development contains three levels. At the first level, rules and social expectations represent an external characteristic for individual. For example, the reason of not stealing something from store is the laws and possibility of catching by police. So at this level, behavior depends upon the legal results like punishment. At the second level, the expectations and rules of others are internalized and identification occurs. Namely, sociality is the root of moral decision making. At the last level, individual define moral rules and differs from others. For example individual does not steal because of an idea that stealing is an extortion of rights or freedom of others (Kohlberg, 1984, Cottone *et al.*, 2007: 37, Jeffries, 2011: 204). This approach is widely used and benefited in child education systems (Yuksel, 2005: 329).

Moral intelligence can be defined as the cognitive capacity to specify how universal rules (integrity, responsibility, compassion, forgiveness) are used. Moral competence is the ability of behaving according to moral principles (Lennick and Kiel, 2005, Veach and Asce, 2006: 97-101). At the beginning of 2000's, since the reliability toward honesty and integrity of free market system has been lost, value of stocks in the markets decreased more than 1 billion dollars. Under these conditions, scientists who come up with a different approach to moral intelligence are Lennick and Kiel. They claim that, neuroscientific studies show that people are born to be moral. We are not born with knowledge of speaking and morality, but we are born to speak and develop moral compass. Moral intelligence develops at the early years of life and takes place in other parts of life like commercial transaction. Moral intelligence is necessary for defining individual goals (Lennick and Kiel, 2006: 13).

Moral intelligence is required for a successful leadership. A person has to know his/her properties like goals, wishes, values, strengths, weaknesses, necessary information to learn and necessary behaviors to change etc. Determining and knowing self values results to create reliable cultural environment by realizing and explaining self and others. Moral intelligence is among the ideals. Personal reality and ideals must be linked in terms of integrity, responsibility, compassion and forgiveness. When people behave according to these principles, they are referred as morally intelligent. At this point, people can learn and improve behaviors in accordance with the moral principle. Individual values and moral values must be harmonious and continually controlled. And behaviors should also be in harmony with goals and moral structure (Lennick and Kiel, 2006: 13-16).

Acceptance of moral intelligence as a specific type of intelligence is a new approach and Borba explains moral intelligence as the ability of distinguishing right from wrong. According to his point of view, moral intelligence contains empathy, awareness, self-control, respect, politeness, tolerance and fairness (Borba, 2001). And researches show that immoral behaviors increase many negative behaviors like suicide, infanticide, forcing behavior, alcohol and drug addiction, distractibility, hyperactivity and depression (Borba, 2003: 14-15).

#### **4. Moral Intelligence and Businesses**

Moral intelligence may contribute to learning, development and performances of organizations like other information, ability and competencies. In other words, the subject that

should be also considered at group levels like departments or working teams (Wickham and O'Donohue, 2012, 22-23).

Constructing an ethical organization structure and ensuring ethical decision making is a current leading issue (Wickham and O'Donohue, 2012), in terms of being sustainable, consistent, rightful and reaching organizational goals (Sama and Shoaf, 2008: 39). To achieve ethically intelligent organization; creating an ethical climate in which common ethically accepted behaviors are determined (Victor and Cullen, 1988), supporting ethical leadership, using ethically suitable sources and capabilities (Wickham and O'Donohue, 2012: 11) and defining general ethical rules and standards (Campbell, 2006: 925, 936) can be possible.

To overcome national and global over fluctuations, ethical leadership is an important issue. Researches show that ethically responsible firms can have better image and higher customer loyalty and profitability (Bhattacharya and Sen, 2004: 9-24, Gardberg and Fombrun, 2006). Moreover ethical organizations can recruit better and loyal personnel (Fulmer, 2004: 307) and moral development of workers related with more honest, less violent work place and less propensity to change job (Wanek, 1999: 4). In addition to these, moral development should be benefited in terms of job security which is an important issue for workers, sectors and politicians. Because moral development can contribute develop positive attitudes and behaviors toward work place accidents (Jeffries, 2011).

### **5. Moral Intelligence and Sustainable Consumption**

Sustainable consumption is necessary to live in a better environment and social and economic development especially today's industrialized economies. Also rapidly urbanizing and developing countries, in which people pursuit consumption oriented lifestyles and face environmental related problems (Haron *et al.*, 2005). So determining the factors that initiate more sustainable behaviors is an important task of researches. Sustainable consumption refers to a more chary consumption style to live more and better. In other words, sustainable consumption has moral viewpoint and revealing possible relationships between these factors would be useful for consumers, marketers and society as a whole.

Within an environmental life, sustainable production, consumption and lifestyle are main issues to be researched (Spaargaren, 2003). Especially in industrial regions, excess consumption leads environmental degradation. Several personal, social and contextual factors are related with sustainable consumption like; positive attitudes about environmental protection, norms, knowledge, socio economic properties, living conditions (Carmen and Kast, 2003), involvement, perceived availability, values (Vermeir and Verbeke, 2006: 169), business promoting activities (Michaelis, 2003), policy programs (Tukker *et al.*, 2008), technology changes and business practices (like work hour reduction etc.) (Schor, 2005), environmental awareness (Haron *et al.*, 2005) etc. But since the market share for ethical products can be at low levels (for example 5 percent of total sales for food sector) (Young *et al.*, 2010), the reasons of these attitude, value and behavior gaps should be researched.

Each customer has different motives, perceptions and preferences. Their behavior can vary with many factors like age, income, education, personality and attitudes toward risk etc. (Kotler and Armstrong, 1996: 193) As a result, people represent different preferences and conduct different purchasing processes. At this point, as a current research area, moral intelligence and the role of moral intelligence in consumer behavior should be researched as a

kind of a psychological and partially cultural feature that vary greatly person to person. People with different traits, can behave in different ways. At this point the answer of the question of “Whether do people represent different consumption patterns, who differently evaluate effects of their behaviors on others?” can be researched.

## 6. A Field Research on Young Consumers about Moral Intelligence and Sustainable Consumption Relationship

### 6.1. Goal and Importance of the Research

The goal of this research is investigating the relationship between moral intelligence and sustainable consumption of specified students. By this way, the role of a generally overlooked psychological factor on consumer behavior, is supposed to be pointed out partially.

### 6.2. Method, Model and Hypotheses of the Research

Under the framework of the study, face to face survey is conducted on students of Keskin Vocational High School of Turkey. Moral intelligence and sustainable consumption is measured with the help of prior developed scales.

Moral decision making is cognitive subject which is so difficult to measure (Wallach *et al.*, 2010: 454). Determining moral principles is prior difficult problem which has to be overcome. At this point, Lennick and Kiel (2005)’s principles is preferred in many academic studies. In addition to this, moral competence inventory of Martin and Austin (2010) is benefited (Martin and Austin, 2010).

Research hypotheses are determined as following:

**H1:** Moral intelligence represents difference with respect to gender.

**H2:** Moral intelligence represents difference with respect to age.

**H3:** Moral intelligence represents difference with respect to income.

**H4:** Moral intelligence is positively related with sustainable consumption.

### 6.3. Research Population and Sample

Research population is determined as students who take education in Keskin Vocational High School between the years of 2013-2014 because of budget and time constraints. (1524 people, <http://oidb.kku.edu.tr/istatistikler.html>, 19.03.2014.) For this reason research results can not be generalized to all consumers. Research is conducted with 366 randomly selected students.

### 6.4. Reliability Analysis

Research questions are subjected to reliability analysis. As a result of the analysis, reliability coefficients are high enough as seen in the Table 1.

**Table 1. Reliability Analysis**

	Cronbach's Alpha	Number of Items
Sustainable Consumption	0,89	17
Moral Intelligence	0,93	26
General	0,95	43

### 6.5. Factor Analysis for Moral Intelligence

Questions about moral intelligence are subjected to factor analysis. Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin coefficient is determined as 0,850, which means data set is suitable for factor analysis (sig. 0,000). Total explained variance is % 62,6. Factors are named with respect to questions they contain as; “Integrity-honesty” (1. factor), “active effort and responsibility for others” (2. factor), “accepting errors and self forgiveness (3. factor), “taking course and secrecy” (4. factor), “accepting others’ mistakes” (5. factor) and “forgiveness-consistency” (6. factor). Factor analysis results are seen in the table 2.

**Table 2. Factor Analysis for Moral Intelligence**

		Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
		Total	% Variance	Cumulative %
<b>1. Factor: Integrity, Honesty, Persistence</b>		<b>4,465</b>	<b>17,172</b>	<b>17,172</b>
I always tell the truth, if there is not a moral inconvenience	,801			
I'd follow end of work when agreed to do	,761			
I do not hesitate to say what I know correctly	,700			
I can clearly indicate the principle, value and beliefs that guide my behavior	,667			
I defend what I think as right	,567			
When making decisions, I do evaluate the appropriateness to my principles.	,557			
People around me say I'm committed to honesty	,530			
When I could not keep my promise, I do compensate	,386			
<b>2. Factor: Active Effort for Others and Responsibility</b>		<b>3,359</b>	<b>12,919</b>	<b>30,091</b>
I strive to achieve their goals around me	,797			
I endeavor to meet the needs around me	,718			
I endeavor to solve the problems of my friends	,717			
If I see someone doing something wrong, I tried to counter	,512			
I can discuss my mistakes with my friends	,478			
<b>3. Factor: Accepting Errors and Self-forgiveness</b>		<b>2,703</b>	<b>10,398</b>	<b>40,489</b>
When I make mistake, I take responsibility to correct the results	,713			
I tell people's mistakes in a respectful manner	,642			
I take my decision considering the results	,623			
I can forgive myself, when I make an important mistake	,531			
I accept my mistakes and results of my mistakes	,521			
<b>4. Factors: Taking Course and Secrecy</b>		<b>2,260</b>	<b>8,693</b>	<b>49,182</b>
I take lessons from my past mistakes	,789			
My friends trust me about keeping secret	,785			

<b>5. Factor: Accepting the Mistakes of Others</b>		<b>1,952</b>	<b>7,507</b>	<b>56,689</b>
When I forgive someone, I know myself too helpful	,775			
I was known as a compassionate one	,721			
<b>6. Factor: Forgiveness and Consistency</b>		<b>1,539</b>	<b>5,918</b>	<b>62,607</b>
I accept my mistakes and wrong behaviors	,590			
Even negatively affects my life, I let necessary institutions and people know unethical- illegal conditions	,550			
When things go wrong, I do not blame people	,545			
People around me say that my behaviors are very consistent with my values and beliefs	,417			

“Integrity and honesty” is related with telling and defending truths, following works till the end and being honest. “Active effort and responsibility for others” is about struggling for other people and their needs. Thirdly, “accepting errors and self forgiveness” is related with accepting and correcting the mistakes. Fourth “taking course and secrecy” means that taking lessons from past mistakes and being known as secretive by others. Fifth “accepting the mistakes of others” is explains the compassionate. At last “forgiveness and consistency” is related with not blaming others and representing consistency in terms of value, belief and behavior.

**6.6. Factor Analysis for Sustainable Consumption**

Questions about sustainable consumption are subjected to factor analysis. Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin coefficients (sig. 0,000) is determined as 0,857. Total explained variance is % 62,2 which shows the validity of the research instrument. Factors are named as; “sustainable product using” (1. factor), “purchasing sustainable products” (2. factor), “not purchasing” (3. factor) and “frugality” (4. factor) as seen in the table 3.

**Table 3. Factor Analysis for Sustainable Consumption**

		Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
		Total	% Variance	Cumulative %
<b>1. Factor: Sustainable Product Usage</b>		<b>3,104</b>	<b>18,257</b>	<b>18,257</b>
I close tools (TVs, stereos etc.) that I don’t use	,759			
I turn off lights of the rooms that I don’t use	,705			
I use public transportation vehicles (minibus, service etc.)	,680			
Instead of renewing every year, I use my mobile phone 3-5 years	,680			
I use saving light bulbs	,679			
I run washing machine and dishwasher when it is fully charged	,436			
<b>2. Factor: Sustainable Product Purchasing</b>		<b>2,570</b>	<b>15,120</b>	<b>33,377</b>

I purchase environment friendly products like detergent, shampoo and deodorant	,774			
I prefer energy-saving products	,695			
I prefer organic fruits and vegetables	,593			
Instead of plastic packaged products, I purchase paper packaged products	,587			
<b>3. Factor: Not Purchasing</b>		<b>2,538</b>	<b>14,932</b>	<b>48,309</b>
I rent or share products rather than purchase if possible	,788			
I would prefer to walk rather than ride in car if possible	,737			
I evaluate dead batteries, used papers and bottles	,641			
I prefer to repair rather than buying new products	,459			
<b>4. Factor: Frugality</b>		<b>2,365</b>	<b>13,909</b>	<b>62,218</b>
I use paper towels sparingly	,788			
I don't use cleaners for household cleaning	,778			
I share books rather than buy	,515			

“Sustainable product using” summarizes the consumer behaviors like closing products that are don’t used, turning of unnecessary open lights, using public transportation, using saving light bulbs etc. And “sustainable product purchasing” is explains the behaviors like purchasing environmentally friendly, energy saving or organic products. Third “not purchasing” is about preferring repairing and evaluating the old products instead of buying a new one. At last “frugality” is related with using products sparingly. Research hypotheses are tested according to factor analyses results.

### 6.7. Difference Analyses

To test the differentiability of moral intelligence factors in terms of gender, independent samples t-test is conducted. According to results, males have meaningfully high values for the “accepting the mistakes of others”. On the other hand, meaningful differences for other factors are not seen. And research hypothesis of “Moral intelligence represents difference with respect to gender” is partially accepted. Differences in terms of gender are seen in table 4.



**Table 4. Differences in terms of Gender**

	<b>Gender</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>
<b>Integrity, Honesty, Persistence</b>	<b>Female</b>	235	4,2388
	<b>Male</b>	129	4,2297
<b>Sig. 0,91</b>			
<b>Active Effort and Responsibility for Others</b>	<b>Female</b>	235	4,1260
	<b>Male</b>	129	4,0713
<b>Sig. 0,46</b>			
<b>Accepting Errors and Self-forgiveness</b>	<b>Female</b>	235	4,0102
	<b>Male</b>	129	3,9674
<b>Sig. 0,57</b>			
<b>Taking Course and Secrecy</b>	<b>Female</b>	232	4,3060
	<b>Male</b>	129	4,3915
<b>Sig. 0,38</b>			
<b>Accepting the Mistakes of Others</b>	<b>Female</b>	235	3,8447
	<b>Male</b>	129	4,0659
<b>Sig. 0,03</b>			
<b>Forgiveness and Consistency</b>	<b>Female</b>	235	3,9404
	<b>Male</b>	129	3,8256
<b>Sig. 0,12</b>			

Anova analysis show that only the factor of “taking course and secrecy” differs with respect to age. According the results, students with the age of 17-19, has meaningfully lower level of “taking course and secrecy”. On the other hand other factors do not represent differences in terms of moral intelligence. Differences with respect to age are seen in the Table 5. So research hypothesis of “Moral intelligence represents difference with respect to age” is partially accepted.

**Table 5. Differences in terms of Age**

	<b>Age</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>
<b>Integrity, Honesty, Persistence</b>	<b>17-19</b>	32	4,25
	<b>20-22</b>	269	4,23
	<b>23 and above</b>	63	4,23
<b>Sig. 0,99</b>			
<b>Active Effort and Responsibility for Others</b>	<b>17-19</b>	32	4,19
	<b>20-22</b>	269	4,06
	<b>23 and above</b>	63	4,24
<b>Sig. 0,18</b>			

<b>Accepting Errors and Self-forgiveness</b>	<b>17-19</b>	32	3,93
	<b>20-22</b>	269	4,01
	<b>23 and above</b>	63	3,92
<b>Sig. 0,56</b>			
<b>Taking Course and Secrecy</b>	<b>17-19</b>	32	3,98
	<b>20-22</b>	269	4,41
	<b>23 and above</b>	63	4,22
<b>Sig. 0,02</b>			
<b>Accepting the Mistakes of Others</b>	<b>17-19</b>	32	3,70
	<b>20-22</b>	269	3,90
	<b>23 and above</b>	63	4,10
<b>Sig. 0,14</b>			
<b>Forgiveness and Consistency</b>	<b>17-19</b>	32	3,81
	<b>20-22</b>	269	3,91
	<b>23 and above</b>	63	3,88
<b>Sig. 0,68</b>			

In addition to these, possible moral intelligence differences with respect to income are also evaluated. And there are not seen meaningful differences as seen in the Table 6. So research hypothesis of “Moral intelligence represents difference with respect to income” is rejected.

**Table 6. Differences in terms of Income**

	<b>Age</b>	<b>N</b>	<b>Mean</b>
<b>Integrity, Honesty, Persistence</b>	<b>300 and below</b>	132	4,30
	<b>301-750</b>	127	4,22
	<b>751 and above</b>	105	4,15
<b>Sig. 0,33</b>			
<b>Active Effort and Responsibility for Others</b>	<b>300 and below</b>	132	4,09
	<b>301-750</b>	127	4,21
	<b>751 and above</b>	105	3,99
<b>Sig. 0,07</b>			
<b>Accepting Errors and Self-forgiveness</b>	<b>300 and below</b>	132	4,06
	<b>301-750</b>	127	3,89
	<b>751 and above</b>	105	4,02
<b>Sig. 0,13</b>			
<b>Taking Course and Secrecy</b>	<b>300 and below</b>	132	4,31
	<b>301-750</b>	127	4,28
	<b>751 and above</b>	105	4,43
<b>Sig. 0,44</b>			
<b>Accepting the Mistakes of Others</b>	<b>300 and below</b>	132	3,90
	<b>301-750</b>	127	3,91
	<b>751 and above</b>	105	3,94

			<b>Sig. 0,95</b>
<b>Forgiveness and Consistency</b>	<b>300 and below</b>	132	4,00
	<b>301-750</b>	127	3,81
	<b>751 and above</b>	105	3,89
			<b>Sig. 0,06</b>

### 6.8. Relationships Analyses

To test the relationship related research hypotheses, correlation analysis is conducted which indicates the relationships among variables as seen in the Table 7. According to analysis results, meaningful relationships are seen among research variables and research hypothesis of “Moral intelligence is positively related with sustainable consumption” is accepted.

**Table 7. Correlations among Moral Intelligence and Sustainable Consumption**

		<b>S.P. Usage</b>	<b>S. Purchasing</b>	<b>Not Purchasing</b>	<b>Frugality</b>
<b>Integrity&amp;Honesty</b>	Pearson Correlation	,661(**)	,512(**)	,386(**)	,209(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,000	,000
<b>Active Effort and Responsibility for Others</b>	Pearson Correlation	,500(**)	,449(**)	,328(**)	,194(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,000	,000
<b>Accepting Errors and Self-forgiveness</b>	Pearson Correlation	,613(**)	,561(**)	,398(**)	,239(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,000	,000
<b>Taking Course and Secrecy</b>	Pearson Correlation	,494(**)	,414(**)	,289(**)	,155(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,000	,003
<b>Accepting the Mistakes of Others</b>	Pearson Correlation	,286(**)	,287(**)	,238(**)	,260(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,000	,000
<b>Forgiveness and Consistency</b>	Pearson Correlation	,541(**)	,576(**)	,429(**)	,343(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	,000	,000	,000	,000

As correlation analysis results investigated; “sustainable product using” is meaningfully (moderate to high) related with the moral intelligence factors of “integrity-honesty” (correlation coefficient is 0,661), “accepting errors-self forgiveness” (correlation coefficient is 0,613), “forgiveness-consistency” (correlation coefficient is 0,541) and “active effort-responsibility for others” (correlation coefficient is 0,500).

Moreover “sustainable product purchasing” is also closely related with the moral intelligence factors of “forgiveness-consistency” (correlation coefficient is 0,576), “accepting errors-self forgiveness” (correlation coefficient is 0,561) and “integrity-honesty” (correlation coefficient is 0,512).

Furthermore “not purchasing” as a kind of sustainable consumption pattern is moderately related with moral intelligences. “Forgiveness-consistency” (correlation coefficient is 429) is mostly correlated factor with this consumption style.

At last “frugality” has meaningful and low relationships with the moral intelligence factors. At this point, “forgiveness-consistency” is mostly related factor with this part of sustainable consumption (correlation coefficient is 0,343).

## **7. Conclusion and Suggestions**

This study shows that moral intelligence is an important determinant of sustainable consumption of young consumers and provides useful information for society, customer, firm and governments. By illustrating the moral intelligence and sustainable consumption relationship, firms can be more customer oriented and develop better marketing offers with respect to moral intelligence features and tendencies of customers. By this way needed, demanded and expected goods and services can be offered to market which can contribute to profits and better fulfillment of needs and wishes. Furthermore resources can be used more productively, excess and unnecessary activities can be decreased and environmentally friendly marketing offerings can be developed with a broader perspective. Moreover, governmental authorities can touch moral intelligence and sustainable consumption link when designing campaigns that encourage sustainable consumption.

Futures researches can be made to illustrate the role of moral intelligence on consumer behavior and marketing practices. At this point following subjects can be researched:

- Relationships among moral intelligence and consumption styles like hedonic consumption, impulsive consumption and conspicuous consumption etc.
- Relationships among moral intelligence specific consumer behaviors and attitudes like customer loyalty, word of mouth, price consciousness, brand awareness etc.
- Relationships between moral intelligence of marketer and ethical marketing performance.

## **8. References**

- Aborn, M. (2006) “An Intelligent Use For Belief”, *Education*, 127(1): 83-85.
- Altan, M. Z. (2011). “Çoklu Zeka Kuramı ve Değerler Eğitimi”, *Pegem Journal of Education and Teaching* 1(4): 53-57.
- Bhattacharya, C. B. & Sen, S. (2004) “Doing Better at Doing Good: When, Why, and How Consumers Respond to Corporate Social Initiatives”, *California Management Review*, 47(1): 9-24.
- Borba, M. (2001) “Building moral intelligence”. Jossey-Bass.
- Borba, M. (2003) “Tips for Building Moral Intelligence in Students”, *Curriculum Review*, 42(7): 14-15.
- Campbell, J. L. (2006) “Institutional Analysis and the Paradox of Corporate Social Responsibility”, *American Behavioral Scientist*, 49(7): 925-938.
- Clarken, 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.

- Clarcken, R.H. (2010) "Considering Moral Intelligence as part of a Holistic Education", Paper presented at the annual meeting of American Educational Research Association, Denver.
- Cottone, J., Drucker, P. & Javier, R. (2007) "Predictors of Moral Reasoning: Components of Executive Functioning and Aspects of Religiosity", *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 46(1): 37-53.
- Fulmer, R. M. (2004) "The Challenge of Ethical Leadership", *Organizational Dynamics*, 33(3): 307-317.
- Gardberg, N. A. & Fombrun, C. J. (2006) "Corporate Citizenship: Creating Intangible Assets Across Institutional Environments", *Academy of Management Review*, 31(2):329-346.
- Gardner, H. (1998) "A Multiplicity of Intelligences", *Scientific American Presents*, 9(4): 19-23.
- Haron, S. A., Paim, L. & Yahaya, N. (2005) "Towards Sustainable Consumption: An Examination of Environmental Knowledge among Malaysians", *International Journal of Consumer Studies*, 29(5): 426-436.
- Hass, A.. (1998) *Doing the Right Thing Cultivating Your Moral Intelligence*, New York: Pocket Books.
- Hogan, R. (1973) "Moral Conduct and Moral Character: A Psychological Perspective", *Psychological Bulletin*, 79: 217-231.
- Jeffries, F. L. (2011) "Predicting Safety Related Attitudes in the Workplace: The Influence of Moral Maturity and Emotional Intelligence", *Journal of Behavioral and Applied Management*, 12(3): 200-216.
- Kohlberg, L. (1984) *The psychology of moral development*, San Francisco: Harper & Row.
- Kotler, P. & Armstrong, G. (1996). *Principles of Marketing*, International Seventh Edition, New Jersey: Pearson.
- Lennick D., & Kiel, F. (2006) "Moral Intelligence for Successful Leadership", *Leader to Leader*, 2006(40): 13-16.
- Lennick, D., & Kiel, F. (2005) *Moral Intelligence: Enhancing Business Performance & Leadership Success*, New Jersey: Wharton School Publishing.
- Martin, D.E. & Austin, B. (2010) "Moral Competency Inventory Validation: Content, Construct, Convergent and Discriminant Approaches", *Management Research Review*, 33(5): 437-451.
- Michaelis, L. (2003) "The Role of Business in Sustainable Consumption", *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 11(8): 915-921.
- Sama, L.M. & Shoaf, V. (2008) "Ethical Leadership for the Professions: Fostering a Moral Community", *Journal of Business Ethics*, 78: 39- 46.
- Schor, J., B. (2005) "Sustainable Consumption and Worktime Reduction", *Journal of Industrial Ecology*, 9(1-2): 37-50.
- Spaargaren, G. (2003) "Sustainable Consumption: A Theoretical and Environmental Policy Perspective", *Society & Natural Resources: An International Journal*, 16(8): 687-701.
- Steiner, J. M. (2000) "The Role of Religion as the Site for Moral and Social Intelligence: The Case of Germany and National Socialism", *Crime, Law & Social Change*, 34: 61-75.
- Sternberg, R. J. (1990) *Handbook of Human Intelligence*. New York: Cambridge University Press.
- Taner, C., & Kast, S.W. (2003) "Promoting Sustainable Consumption: Determinants of Green Purchases by Swiss Consumers", *Psychology & Marketing*, 20(10): 883-902.

- Tukker, A. , Emmert, S., Charter, M., Vezzoli, C., Sto, E., Andersen, M. M., Geerken, T., Tischner, U., & Lahlou, S. (2008) "Fostering Change to Sustainable Consumption and Production: An Evidence Based View", *Journal of Cleaner Production*, 16(11): 1218-1225.
- Veach, C.M. & Asce, P.E.F. (2006) "There's No Such Thing as Engineering Ethics", *Leadership and Management in Engineering*, 6(3): 97-101.
- Vermeir, I. & Verbeke, W. (2006) "Sustainable Food Consumption: Exploring the Consumer "Attitude- Behavioral Intention" Gap", *Journal of Agricultural and Environmental Ethics*,19: 169-194.
- Victor , B., & Gullen, JB. (1988) "The Organizational Bases of Ethical Work Climates", *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 33(1): 101-125.
- Wallach, W., Franklin, S. & Allen, C. (2010) "A Conceptual and Computational Model of Moral Decision Making in Human and Artificial Agents", *Topics in Cognitive Science*, 2: 454-485.
- Wanek, J. E. (1999) "Integrity and Honesty Testing: What do we know? How do we use it?", *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 7 (4): 183-195.
- Wickham, M. & O'Donohue, W. (2012) "Developing an Ethical Organization: Exploring the Role of Ethical Intelligence", *Organization Development Journal*, 30(2): 9-29.
- Young, W., Hwang, K., McDonald, S. & Oates, C. J. (2010) "Sustainable Consumption: Green Consumer Behaviour When Purchasing Products", *Sustainable Development*, 18(1): 20-31.
- Yuksel, S. (2005) "Kohlberg and Hidden Curriculum in Moral Education: An Opportunity for Students' Acquisition of Moral Values", *Educational Sciences: Theory&Practice*, 5(2): 329-338.