

The Relationship Between Academic Leaders' Moral Intelligence and Ethical Leadership Behaviors*

(Research Article)

Akademik Liderlerin Ahlaki Zekâları ile Etik Liderlik Davranışları Arasındaki İlişki

Doi: 10.29023/alanyaakademik.1051163

Mehtap ARAS

Dr. Öğr. Üyesi, Tokat Gaziosmanpaşa Üniversitesi,

mehtap.aras@gop.edu.tr

Orcid No: 0000-0003-1194-8123

How to cite this article: Aras, M. (2022). *The Relationship Between Academic Leaders' Moral Intelligence and Ethical Leadership Behaviors*. *Alanya Academic Review*, Vol:6, No:3, p.3309-3326.

ABSTRACT

Keywords:

Moral,
Moral intelligence,
Leadership,
Ethical leadership

Received: 30.12.2021

Accepted: 14.09.2022

The aim of this study is to investigate whether there is a relationship between moral intelligence levels and ethical leadership behaviors. For this purpose, the study examined the relationship between the moral intelligence and ethical leadership behaviors of academic leaders. The research population consists of academicians working at a state university and having administrative duties. Dean, deputy dean, chief of department, director of research and application center, assistant director research and application center, director of vocational school were selected as administrative duties. The data of the study were collected by online survey method. Three-dimensional moral intelligence scale and four-dimensional ethical leadership scale expressions were directed to academicians with administrative duties. The questionnaire was sent to all academic leaders through the press and public relations office via e-mail. 133 questionnaires were used in the analysis and the data were analyzed with the SPSS 26 program. According to the correlation results, it was concluded that there is a significant and strong relationship between moral intelligence and ethical leadership behavior and its sub-dimensions and ethical leadership. The results of the regression analysis revealed that empathy, self-control, and kindness, which are the sub-dimensions of moral intelligence, are effective on ethical leadership behavior.

1. INTRODUCTION

To live together, social order must be established, and everyone must comply with this order. There are different rules that ensure social order. These can be classified as religious rules, moral rules, customs and traditions, legal rules, etiquette. Of course, the rules of each society also differ. For example, the rules of the religions that one belongs to differ, or the rules of

* Bu çalışma, Tokat Gaziosmanpaşa Üniversitesi Sosyal ve Beşeri Bilimler Araştırmaları Etik Kurulu'nun 08.11.2021 tarih ve 01-22 sayılı onayına göre gerçekleştirilmiştir.

etiquette also differ in societies. Even if the rules of law, religious rules, customs, and traditions differ, there are good-bad, and right-wrongs based on moral rules. Even if they are not separated from each other with certain lines, good and bad or right wrong have a common meaning in all societies. Enlightenment thought emphasizes that people can rely on reason to set moral norms and that they do not need a God-given intuition or a religious authority to distinguish between good and bad (Gündüz, 2010: 159). Until the enlightenment thought, the distinction between good and bad and right and wrong was a matter of religious authority, but later, different branches of science began to explore the concept of morality. The moral system is an integral part of our social life and social order. For this reason, we must use different forms of intelligence to ensure moral order in our social life and to live in this system (Gündüz, 2010: 159; Pana, 2006: 258). No matter how much development and progress are achieved in intelligence and science, the satisfaction of many needs such as happiness, freedom, equality, dignity, sense of justice, and peace of man depends on ethical accumulation and moral development (Mahmutoğlu, 2009: 227).

There are many factors for organizations to be successful. When considered as a whole, management is the most important key to success in organizations. The success of each department or unit in the organization needs to be well managed, and for the organization to be successful, these functions need to be managed well in a coordinated way. Managing is also human work. The importance of the concept of leadership comes into play here. Understanding and managing human nature is quite difficult. Therefore, leadership is an important issue that management literature frequently studies and new information emerges every day. Human nature is very complex and very different from each other in terms of character and structure (Aras, 2021: 35). For this reason, dozens of leadership styles are researched in the literature. Since the 1930s, when the concept of leadership began to be researched in the literature, nearly forty leadership styles have been put forward and studies have been carried out on these leadership styles. One of these leadership styles is ethical leadership.

Ethics are universal norms formed by different moral understandings (Gök, 2008: 6). Ethics and morality are concepts that are often used together. The concepts of good-bad, right-wrong apply to these both concepts. Morality and ethics are similar but different concepts. Morality is a set of rules reflected in ethics as a discipline and a mechanism of values that shape and direct attitudes, actions, and beliefs (Ellemers et al., 2019: 336).

It is one of the main responsibilities of a good leader to ensure that the functions of the organization are performed by ethical rules for the organization to reach its goal (Haq, 2011: 2792). Ethical leadership is a type of leadership in which the leader behaves in accordance with professional ethical principles as well as current laws and policies while achieving organizational goals. Ethical leader who is the person directs the behavior of the employees of the organization, develop ethical standards and apply these standards (Çengelci, 2014: 1).

Successful and high-performing leaders have cognitive, emotional, behavioral and social abilities together (Bass, 2001; Hoffman and Frost, 2006). However, studies examining the relationship between leadership and intelligence are limited to emotional intelligence, social intelligence and cognitive intelligence. In the literature, studies have been carried out on leadership and emotional intelligence (Antonakis, Ashkanasy, and Dasborough, 2009; Cavazotte, Kamal et al., 2017; Edelman and Knippenberg, 2018; Hajnel and Vučenović, 2020; Higgs, 2002; Maamari and Majdalani, 2017; Mathew and Gupta, 2015), cognitive

intelligence (Boyatzis et al., 2012; Hoffman and Frost, 2006; Rosete and Ciarrochi, 2005), social intelligence (Boyatzis et al., 2012; Hoffman and Frost, 2006; Garg, Jain and Punia, 2021; Shahid, 2017). Riggio, Murphy and Pirozzolo (2002) examining the relationship between leadership and intelligence, they associated leadership with social, emotional, successful cognitive and sociopolitical intelligence. Emotional intelligence has often been studied in with transformational leadership (Al-Azzam, 2015; Hartsfield, 2003. Baba et al., (2019) examined the relationship between emotional intelligence and transformational leadership in academic leaders. It has been concluded that the narcissistic personality traits of the leaders have an effect on their social intelligence (Muradoğlu and Karabulut, 2020). Hoffman and Frost (2006) found a significant relationship between emotional intelligence and transformational leadership style. Edelman and Knippenberg (2018) had found stronger relationship between emotional intelligence and leadership effectiveness.

The relationship between intelligence and leadership has been the subject of many studies. The relationship between leadership and intelligence is closely related, and leadership cannot be done independently of intelligence. Studies have examined the relationship between intelligence types and leadership types in different samples. Academics are scientists who train human resources in every field. For this reason, the leadership styles of academic leaders and other academics they lead are also important. Baba et al. (2019) stated the importance of academic leaders as “although there are several aspects that need to be monitored and managed in educational institutions, yet one of the features in increasing the effectiveness, adeptness and ultimate attainment of results is the appropriate leadership behavior of academic administrators (leaders)”. The indicator of moral intelligence is not only the thoughts, values, and beliefs; to what extent and to what effect they can be put into practice (Kanoğlu, 2019). Along with many variables that affect leadership, intelligence also has an important effect. Based on the results that intelligence types have an effect on leader behavior in the literature, the effects of moral intelligence on leader behavior have been examined. No quantitative research has been found on ethical leader behavior of moral intelligence. It is thought that the research will contribute to the literature in terms of being the first quantitative study examining the effects of moral intelligence on ethical leadership behavior.

2. THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

2.1. Moral Intelligence (MI)

Conceptually, the words ethics and morality have very close meanings, but they differ when going into detail. To understand these two concepts deeply, it is necessary to know philosophy. Morality and ethic are the subjects on which many disciplines have researched. Ethics and morality, which are the main research subjects of philosophy, are also at the center of sociology, psychology, law, and theology from the normative sciences that study the practical actions of humans (Pieper, 2012: 107). Also, the fields in which we often use the word morality are art, science, law, tradition, or religion (Frankena, 1973). While the concept of morality is about concrete values, ethical principles mostly describe notional definitions and concepts. In other words, ethics deals with procedure or form, while morality deals with substance or content (Mahmutoğlu, 2009: 227). Özlem (2004: 22-23) explains the difference between ethics and morality that the ethics is the name of the philosophy discipline that deals with this phenomenon, examine, and classifies moral views and teachings, reveals the similarities and differences between them, and compares and criticizes them. Another difference is that morality is used more locally, whereas the concept of ethics is used more

universally. However, morality is the area where universal principles and rules are first experienced and tested. The most important reason for the characterization of morality as local is that it is the characteristic of being shaped according to the culture, social and economic conditions of the society, changing to the region, sometimes contradicting with each other (Mahmutoğlu, 2009: 227). Morality is a form of social consciousness, behavior, and ideological relationship (Aydın, 2001: 3). Another definition, morality is “the rules of action, series of norms and value system created to regulate people's behavior and their relations with each other” (Cevizci, 2009: 135-136).

From Socrates to Kohlberg, many philosophers, thinkers, and scientists have established a relationship between moral thoughts, attitudes and behaviors, and mind and intelligence (Gündüz, 2010: 158). Lennick and Keil (2005: 7) define MI as “our mental capacity to determine how universal human principles -like those embodied by the “golden rule”- should be applied to our personal values, goals, and actions”. According to Fadhil et al. (2021), MI “is efficient, ethical behaviors based on mental and personal abilities and skills, which enhance values and actions for our work and environment.” Boss (1994: 401) define MI different way than “as respect for oneself and others as beings with inherent value”. Another definition belongs to Tanner and Christen (2014: 120) in which they describe MI “as the capability to process moral information and to manage self-regulation in any way that desirable moral ends can be attained.”

The indicator of MI is not only the thoughts, values, and beliefs; to what extent and to what effect they can be put into practice (Kanoğlu, 2019; Karabey, 2021). In other words, MI is the transformation of moral values into action, and it is the sum of many different skills that can be associated with moral attitudes and behaviors such as courtesy, patience, tolerance, respect, conscience, and personal control (Yakut and Yakut, 2021: 837). Moral intelligence involves a combination of knowledge, desire, and power and the way people think, feel and act (Khampa, 2019: 657).

When describing the concept of MI or claiming that a person has moral intelligence, we should mention integrity, responsibility, compassion, and forgiveness. One of the most important qualities that a person with moral intelligence should have honesty. It is obvious that a dishonest person has low moral intelligence (Beheshtifar, Esmaeli and Moghadam, 2011; Far, 2012: 107; Lennick and Kiel, 2005). Another feature is responsibility. It is important to take responsibility for every action a person does and its consequences. Compassion is another indicator of moral intelligence. Compassion is a sign of caring for and respecting others. As the final important feature, we can handle forgiveness. Forgiveness represents both acknowledging that we have our faults and being tolerant of others and our well-being (Lennick and Keil, 2005: 7). In summary, moral intelligence is about the sort of people we are (Boss, 1994: 416).

2.2. Ethical Leadership (EL)

Human nature is very complex and very different from each other in terms of character and structure. For this reason, dozens of leadership styles have been researched in the literature. The study was designed to research ethical leadership. Ethics is an important and very broad concept that enters the research field of the science of philosophy and whose origins date back to the philosophers of the first age. The main subject of ethics is human actions (Pieper, 2012: 17). The concept of ethics can be defined as the examination of the rules of right and

wrong behavior and moral judgments in the most general terms. The concept of morality, which is used with ethics, is both independent of philosophy and one of the main disciplines of philosophy. Ethics, on the other hand, examines the phenomenon of morality on theoretical, conceptual, and logical foundations (Flew, 2005: 179). Frankena (1973) describes ethics that “a branch of philosophy; it is moral philosophy or philosophical thinking about morality, moral problems, and moral judgments”. The fundamental questions of ethics are happiness, freedom, and determination, good or bad (Pieper, 2012: 129-139).

Brown, Treviño and Harrison (2005: 120) define ethical leadership as “the demonstration of normatively appropriate conduct through personal actions and interpersonal relationships, and the promotion of such conduct to followers through two-way communication, reinforcement, and decision-making”. As can be seen from this definition in the literature, ethical leadership is associated with social learning theory (Bandura, 1977). Social learning theory states that individuals learn by imitating the behavior and attitudes of those around them that they perceive as attractive and reliable (Bandura, 1977; 1986). There is a close relationship between social learning theory and ethical leadership. According to social learning theory, ethical leaders guide the ethical behavior of their followers (Treviño, 1986; Zhu, 2008: 64) and ethical leaders should be honest and trustworthy (Brown and Treviño, 2006: 597). At the core of leadership is influence (Yukl, 2002), and followers are influenced by their leader's behavior and may try to emulate the leader by role modeling (Eisenbeiss and Knippenberg, 2015: 183). It is thought that ethical leaders should act honestly, trustworthy, and fair.

Brown, Treviño and Harrison (2005) and De Hoogh and Den Hartog (2008) evaluated ethical leadership in three dimensions. These dimensions are **morality and fairness**, **role clarification** and **power sharing**. Morality and fairness emphasize that ethical leaders should be honest, reliable, fair, and concerned with their followers. Role clarification emphasizes ethical leaders' behaviors such as being in open communication, encouraging and rewarding the ethical behavior of the followers, and clarifying the expectations and responsibilities of the followers. Power sharing is about empowering followers. Also, power-sharing allows the followers to participate in decision-making, listening to the views, feelings, and thoughts of the followers (Alkan, 2015: 114; De Hoogh and Den Hartog, 2008: 299).

2.3. Moral Intelligence and Ethical Leadership

Moral intelligence is an important guide for leaders in the modern world (Beheshtifar et al, 2011: 6). Beheshtifar et.al (2011: 6) emphasized that “a manager with high in moral intelligence is the executive of organizational intelligence.” Nevertheless, there has been no quantitative research the effects of moral intelligence on business performance (Lennick and Kiel, 2005: 13). Moral intelligence is an intelligence that all people should have, not just ethical leadership (Lennick and Keil, 2005: 10). Ethical leadership has a positive effect on employee job satisfaction and commitment (Brown et al., 2005). Also, Dust et al. (2018) examined the effects of ethical leadership on employee performance. Although not the only determinant of organizational success, moral intelligence is one of the important factors affecting organizational success (Lennick and Keil, 2005: 17-18).

Studies examining the relationship between moral intelligence and leadership (principal leadership, strategic leadership, and transformational leadership) are limited (Engelbrecht and Hendrikz, 2020; Fadhil et al., 2021; Mamede et al.,2014). Mamede et al. (2014) examined the mediating role of transformational leadership in the moral intelligence of leaders and the

affective commitment of employees and concluded that the moral intelligence of the leaders and the affective commitment of the employees indirectly affect the performance of the employees in their affective commitment. Fadhil et al. (2021) concluded that moral intelligence has a positive effect on the improving of strategic leadership. Engelbrecht and Hendrikz (2020) revealed that principled leadership and trust in leaders have a mediating effect on the indirect relationship between moral intelligence and organizational citizenship behavior. Fard (2012: 103) has thoroughly established the relationship between ethical leadership and morality as “Managers rely on moral values, a significant effect on feelings of energy, strength and creativity of their employees to leave the building to the new moral leadership in creating a healthy work environment plays a significant role” and focused more on the concept of moral leadership.

No *quantitative* research has been found in the literature investigating the effects of *moral intelligence* on leader behavior in the workplace. Although there are many studies examining the relationship between leadership and intelligence, no quantitative research has been found that examines the relationship between ethical leadership and moral intelligence. Research between these two concepts has been limited to qualitative research. The moral intelligence levels of the employees are as important as their cognitive, behavioral, social, and emotional intelligence. For this reason, it is thought that the study will make an important contribution to the literature because moral intelligence of leaders affects the performance of the organization (Beheshtifar et al., 2011).

It was mentioned that the concepts of morality and ethics are intertwined and their relationship with each other (Mahmutoğlu, 2009; 226). It is also known that the level of moral intelligence is effective on human behavior. The higher the moral intelligence level of leaders, the more successful they are in ethical decisions-making (Engelbrecht and Hendrikz, 2020: 2) and create trust and commitment in the organization (Fadhil et al., 2021). Therefore, the research investigated the effect of moral intelligence on ethical leadership behavior. In this context, the hypotheses of the research were established as follows:

H1: There is a significant relationship between moral intelligence and ethical leadership.

H1a: There is a significant relationship between empathy and ethical leadership.

H1b: There is a significant relationship between conscience and ethical leadership.

H1c: There is a significant relationship between self-control and ethical leadership.

H1d: There is a significant relationship between kindness and ethical leadership.

H2: Moral intelligence has an impact on ethical leadership behavior.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1. Purpose of the research

The moral intelligence which is the sum of many different skills associated with moral attitudes and behaviors such as courtesy, patience, tolerance, respect, conscience, and personal control. Therefore, it is important whether there is a similarity between the level of moral intelligence and ethical leadership behavior. Since the concepts of ethics and morality cover each other and have close meanings, the effects of moral intelligence level on ethical leadership behavior were investigated in this study. Academic leaders have a very important

role to play in higher educational institutions. Higher education institutions are effective in the development of countries, strengthening their economy and increasing the level of civilization (Baba et al., 2019).

Within the scope of professional ethics, there are some academic ethical principles that academicians must comply with or pay attention to. Academics may have administrative duties as well as academic duties. The main problematic of this study is whether academic leaders with administrative duties have ethical leadership characteristics and the effect of moral intelligence on ethical leader behaviors. The aim of the study is to investigate whether there is a significant relationship between moral intelligence (and its sub-dimensions) and ethical leadership.

3.2. Research Population and Sample

The research was conducted at a state university. The university has 17 faculties, 3 colleges and 13 vocational schools and 21 research and application centers. There are 59 undergraduate and 71 associate degree departments. Dean, deputy dean, chief of department, director of research and application center, assistant director research and application center, director of vocational school were selected as administrative duties. There are 195 defined tasks, and the universe of the research consists of 195 academicians with administrative duties. But some of the academics have multiple administrative duties at the same time. For example, the duties of both dean and department chair; chief of department and head of department; director of research and application center and deputy dean; director of research and application center, department chair and head of department, etc. Therefore, 133 questionnaires were answered. All answered questionnaires were analyzed.

3.3. Ethics Committee Permission

The ethics committee permissions of the study were obtained from the Social and Human Sciences Research Ethics Committee of Tokat Gaziosmanpaşa University in Turkey with the decision dated 16.09.2021 and numbered 19.03. The study was carried out according to the principles of the Declaration of Helsinki.

3.4. Data Collection and Analysis Method

The universe of the research consists of academicians working at a state university in Turkey. In the research, questionnaires were sent to all academic leaders (who have administrative duties) at the university via e-mail through the press and publication center. The research was conducted in the academic year 2021-2022.

In the study, the “Yakut Moral Intelligence Scale” developed by Yakut and Yakut (2021) was used to measure moral intelligence. The scale consists of 4 dimensions as total empathy (E), conscience (C), self-control (SC), and kindness (K) and includes 20 statements. Secondly, the “Ethical Leadership Scale”, which was developed by De Hoogh and Den Hartog (2008) and translated into Turkish by Alkan (2015), was adapted, and analyzed for reliability. The questionnaire is 3-dimensional (morality and fairness (MF), role clarification (RC), power sharing (PS)) and consists of 17 expressions in total. The questionnaires were designed with a 5-point Likert-type rating scale. Cronbach’s Alpha values were calculated as the reliability analysis for the internal consistency of the scales. Correlation analysis was used to test the relationship between moral intelligence and ethical leadership, and regression analysis was

used to examine the effect of moral intelligence on ethical leadership behavior. The data were analyzed with the SPSS 26 program. The level of significance was taken as $p < 0.05$.

4. RESULTS

Demographic information of academic leaders is given in Table 1.

Table 1. Descriptive Statistics on Demographic Characteristics of Research Participants

	n	%
Gender		
Female	61	45.9
Male	72	54.1
Age		
29-36	27	20.3
37-44	64	48.1
45-52	31	23.3
53-60	11	8.3
Professional time		
0-10 years	26	19.5
11-21 years	76	57.2
22-32 years	25	18.8
33-43 years	6	4.5
Administrative Duty		
Dean	6	4.5
Deputy Dean	17	12.8
Chief of Department	33	24.8
Head of Department	39	29.3
Director of Research and Application Center	10	7.5
Assistant Director Research and Application Center	16	12.1
Director of Vocational School	12	9
Administrative Duty Period		
0-5 years	73.7	73.7
6-11 years	21	21
12-17 years	3.0	3.0
18-23 years	2.3	2.3

When the distribution of academic leaders participating in the study according to some introductory characteristics is examined, it was determined that 45.9% of the sample was female, %54.1 of academic leaders were male. It was determined that 57.1% of the leaders included in the study had 11-21 years of experience, 73.7% had 0-5 years in administrative duty and 29.3% worked as a head of department (Table 1).

When the mean scores of the Morale Intelligence Scale of the academic leaders included in the study were examined, the mean score for the Empathy was 4.27 ± 0.59 , the Conscience Sub-Dimension mean score was 4.49 ± 0.59 , the Self-Control Sub-Dimension mean score was 3.79 ± 0.68 , and the Kindness Sub-Dimension mean score was 4.51 ± 0.57 . When the distribution of the Ethical Leadership Scale of academic leaders included in the study were examined, the mean score for the Ethical leadership was 3.99 ± 0.40 . Sub-dimension scores of the participants were analyzed, the mean score of the Morality and fairness Sub-dimension was 3.80 ± 0.40 , the mean score of the Role clarification Sub-dimension was 4.35 ± 0.65 , the mean of the Power Sharing Sub-dimension was 3.88 ± 0.41 . To test the reliability level of the

scales used in the research, the “Cronbach’s Alpha” coefficients were calculated, the reliability of both scales (Moral Intelligence 0.909, Ethical Leadership 0.881) is high (Kalaycı, 2008: 405).

Table 2. Mean Scores of Moral Intelligence Scale According to Academic Leaders' Sociodemographic Characteristics

Variable n=133	Moral Intelligence Scale			
	Empathy	Conscience	Self-Control	Kindness
Age				
29-36	4.2889± .53875	4.5407± .43963	3.9556± .67101	4.5926± .44196
37-44	4.2875± .56442	4.5000± .47543	3.7813± .63117	4.5094± .53206
45-52	4.3032± .48955	4.4516± .66527	3.8323± .65746	4.5871± .41613
53-60	4.0909± 1.09312	4.4909± 1.19453	3.4182± 1.01372	4.1636± 1.19939
Test Statistics	F= 0.380 p= .617	F= 0.107 p= 0.956	F= 1.655 p=.180	F= 1.704 p=0.169
Gender				
Male	4.211± .5473	4.3889± .69192	3.8028± .71404	4.4694± .65706
Female	4.3508± .54730	4.6230± .43066	3.7934± .66027	4.5705± .46881
Test Statistics	Z=-1.367 p= .172	Z=-2.127 p= .033*	Z=-.139 p= .890	Z=-.718 p=.473
Professional Time				
0-10	4.1692±.63672	4.4154±.48307	3.9308±.63231	4.4077±.53809
11-21	4.3316±.50338	4.5053±.50752	3.7711±.63725	4.5763±.47662
22-32	4.2160±.83451	4.4480±.92065	3.7680±.87308	4.4640±.83411
33-43	4.2667±.37238	4.9333±.10328	3.7000±.77717	4.4333±.70899
Test Statistics	F=0.574 p=0.633	F=1.303 p=.276	F=0.413 p=0.744	F=0.682 p=0.564
Administrative Duty				
Dean	3.9000±1.45739	4.1667±1.60208	3.3000±1.37840	3.6667±1.36626
Deputy Dean	4.2824±.50527	4.6235±.39295	3.6235±.59951	4.4706±.52412
Chief of Department	4.3030±.54800	4.6121±.46081	3.9455±.52027	4.6121±.46081
Head of Department	4.1590±.58252	4.4154±.52191	3.8051±.61299	4.3692±.56483
Director of Research and Application Center	4.4400±.39777	4.3000±.73786	3.6200±.56921	4.6200±.35839
Assistant Director Research and Application Center	4.4250±.53603	4.5000±.51121	3.7750±.87293	4.7375±.37036

Director of Vocational School	4.4167±.42176	4.5833±.56862	4.0500±.73916	4.8333±.25346
Test Statistics	F=1.061 p= .390	F=0.985 p= .439	F= 1.367 p= .233	F= 4.370 p=.000*
Note: t: Student t-test; F: one-way ANOVA; p <0.05*				

When the demographic variables of the academicians in the moral intelligence scale were examined, it was concluded that there was a significant difference between conscience and gender. Also, it was concluded that there was a significant difference between kindness and administrative duty.

Table 3. Mean Scores of Ethical Leadership Scale According to Academic Leaders' Sociodemographic Characteristics

Variable n=133	Ethical Leadership Scale		
	Morality and fairness	Role clarification	Power Sharing
Age			
29-36	3.7716± .31402	4.3111± .63569	3.8210± .33310
37-44	3.7943± .37178	4.3281± .61450	3.8932± .41187
45-52	3.9194± .23122	4.4774± .54572	4.0108± .34943
53-60	3.5909± .88306	4.2545± 1.15270	3.6515± .63445
Test Statistics	F=1.967 p= .122	F= 0.512 p= .203	F= 2.437 p= .068
Gender			
Male	3.7454± .44928	4.3194± .69091	3.8773± .41584
Female	3.8689± .33626	4.3934± .62072	3.8962± .41182
Test Statistics	Z=-1.221 p= .222	Z=-.697 p= .486	Z=-.119 p= .905
Professional Time			
0-10	3.7821±.29352	4.3692±63923	3.9359±.34019
11-21	3.8114±.36346	4.3605±.54162	3.8684±.40306
22-32	3.7600±.61629	4.2880±.85260	3.9000±.52705
33-43	3.9444±.22771	4.4667±1.21106	3.8333±.34960
Test Statistics	F=0.367 p=0.777	F=0.147 p=0.932	F=0.211 p=0.889
Administrative Duty			
Dean	3.4167±1.20531	3.7667±1.40523	3.5000±.77460
Deputy Dean	3.8333±.38188	4.4118±.52664	3.6863±.28187
Chief of Department	3.9293±.34367	4.4061±.63538	4.0354±.40560

Head of Department	3.6838±.25591	4.1846±.59892	3.8590±.34100
Director of Research and Application Center	3.8000±.28109	4.3400±.66030	3.9167±.41013
Assistant Director Research and Application Center	3.8542±.40768	4.5875±.57257	3.8750±.44514
Director of Vocational School	3.9167±.18119	4.6667±.43762	4.0278±.36121
Test Statistics	F=2.366 p= .034	F=2.182 P= .049	F= 2.736 p= .016
Note: t: Student t-test; F: one-way ANOVA; p <0.05*			

When the demographic variables of the academicians were examined with the ethical leadership scale, no significant difference was found with any of the variables. When Kurtosis and Skewness values are between -1.5 and +1.5, it is a normal distribution (Tabachnick and Fidell, 2013). Since the data were not normally distributed (Skewness: -2.964 and Kurtosis: 19.507) Spearman rank correlation was checked. Scales was calculated using the Spearman correlation coefficient. The obtained results are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Overview of mean, standard deviation, and correlations

n:13 3	M	SD	1.	2.	3.	4.	5.	6.	7.	8.	9
1.M	4.2	.45	-								
I	7	5									
2.E	4.2	.59	.627	-							
	7	7	**								
3.C	4.4	.59	.612	.293	-						
	9	6	**	**							
4.SC	3.7	.68	.612	.157	.068	-					
	9	7	**								
5.K	4.5	.57	.746	.341	.407	.378	-				
	1	8	**	**	**	**					
6.E	3.9	.40	.511	.405	.295	.295	.433	-			
L	9	3	**	**	**	**	**				
7.M	3.8	.40	.436	.270	.355	.204	.407	.700	-		
F	0	4	**	**	**	*	**	**			
8.R	4.3	.65	.403	.341	.272	.220	.332	.860	.437	-	
C	5	8	**	**	**	*	**	**	**	**	
9.PS	3.8	.41	.405	.329	.122	.327	.309	.772	.393	.497	-
	8	2	**	**		**	**	**	**	**	**

***0.05; ** 0.01 Sig (2 tailed)**

According to the Spearman correlation results, the hypotheses (H₁, H1a, H1b, H1c, H1d) of the research were supported. As a result of the analysis, it was revealed that there is a significant and strong relationship (r= 0.511) between moral intelligence and ethical leadership behavior. There are also a strong and significant relationship between moral intelligence and morality and fairness (r=0.436), power sharing (r=0.405), role clarification (r=0.403), which are a sub-dimension of ethical leadership behavior.

Regression analysis was performed for the effects of moral intelligence on ethical leadership behavior. The regression results are presented in Table 5.

Table 5. Regression Analysis Results on Moral Intelligence and Ethical Leadership Behavior

	B	S.D.	t	P
Constant		.260	6.142	.000
Empathy	.172	.055	3.094	.002*
Conscience	.079	.055	1.419	.158
Self-Control	.132	.045	2.945	.004*
Kindness	.179	.064	2.806	.006*
R = 0.646 Adjusted R ² = 0.399 F= 22.893 Durbin Watson = 1.744				
*.05				

One of the assumptions in regression analysis is that the error terms are not related (autocorrelation) with each other. Durbin Watson test value usually around 1.5-2.5 indicates no autocorrelation (Çoban and Demirhan. 2019: 91; Kalaycı, 2010). The rate of explanation of the dependent variable of the independent variable was calculated as 40%. According to the results of the analysis, moral intelligence has a positive effect on ethical leadership behavior. Apart from the conscience sub-dimension, other sub-dimensions are effective on ethical leadership behavior. Empathy, self-control, and kindness, which are sub-dimensions of moral intelligence, have an effect on ethical leadership behavior. H2 hypothesis was partially accepted.

5. DISCUSSION

Management is about humans. Therefore, everything that affects the nature and behavior of human beings also affects the management activity. Morality and ethics are an important issue that concerns both management and organizational behavior disciplines and needs to be investigated and examined. In the field of organizational behavior, the concepts of cognitive intelligence and emotional intelligence have been studied extensively. In addition to these two bits of intelligences, social intelligence and behavioral intelligence have also been added. Although not as much as these concepts, moral intelligence has started to attract the attention of the field of organizational behavior (Clarcken, 2009: 1).

Leaders are highly effective on employee behavior and organizational behavior. Therefore, the moral aspect of the leader will also affect the employee behavior (Treviño et al., 2003). Behaving away from ethical practices in organizations also reduces the morale of employees (Alshammari, Almutairi and Thuwaini, 2015; Neubert, Wu, and Roberts, 2013). The characteristic features of ethical leadership are that they are honest, reliable, and fair people who attach importance to moral values. Besides that, the most important and distinctive feature of ethical leadership is influencing. This effect creates a mirror effect on the audience. Ethical leaders engage in behaviors that promote honesty by reflecting their own values and beliefs (Kalshoven, Den Hartog, and De Hoogh, 2011). Neubert, Wu and Roberts (2013: 289) concluded that ethical leadership behavior has a very important effect on employee behavior and commitment. Similarly, Tamer (2021) concluded that ethical leadership behavior in healthcare professionals has a very important effect on employee performance and commitment.

This study contributes to our understanding of the linkage among moral intelligence and ethical leadership on academic leaders. According to the research results, there was no significant difference between demographic variables and moral intelligence, except for gender. There was a difference between male and female leaders only in the sub-dimension of conscience (Mann Whitney-U= .033). At the same time, there was no significant difference between demographic variables and ethical leadership. When the sample is examined, it has been observed that the numbers of men and women are close to each other. There may not have been a significant difference due to the education level of the academicians and the fact that they did not experience the glass ceiling[†] obstacle.

Moral intelligence and other types of intelligence are also effective on human behavior and therefore on leader behavior (Beheshtifar et al., 2011: 9). Academic leaders also effective on development of countries because the universities provide skilled, qualified, and competent human resource (Baba et al, 2019: 23). Almost all vocational training is given in universities. In addition to the cognitive intelligence and IQ of scientists, their emotional and moral intelligence is also important for organizational life for them. In addition to producing science, some academics also have administrative duties. Baba et al. (2019) emphasize that the role of leadership in universities is largely determined by the institutional culture. As in every profession, ethical rules and moral behaviors are important in academia and university. In an organization where science is produced, ethical behaviors, ethical leadership and moral teaching can be achieved with this organizational culture. The result of the research revealed that there is a strong relationship between moral intelligence and ethical leadership behavior, and that moral intelligence also has an effect on ethical leadership behavior. Since there is no quantitative research examining the relationship between moral intelligence and ethical leadership in the literature, a comparison could not be made.

As a result of the analysis, it was revealed that there is a significant and strong relationship ($r= 0.511$) between moral intelligence and ethical leadership behavior. There are also a strong and significant relationship between moral intelligence and morality and fairness ($r=0.436$), power sharing ($r=0.405$), role clarification ($r=0.403$), which is a sub-dimension of ethical leadership behavior. The study revealed that there is a significant relationship between ethical leadership behavior of academic leaders with moral intelligence. It was not sufficient to compare research results with qualitative studies. Significant results emerged in the sub-dimensions of moral intelligence and morality and justice. It is an expected result that an academic with moral intelligence or high moral intelligence will behave morally and fairness. Since ethical leadership is closely related to the concepts of ethics and morality, it is an expected result that moral intelligence will have an impact on ethical leadership behavior. As a result of the research, it was concluded that there is a strong and significant relationship between ethical leadership and moral intelligence. There is also significant relationship between moral intelligence and morality and fairness. While expressing the combination of moral intelligence, knowledge, desire and will within the organization, it determines the way of thinking, feeling, and acting (Beheshtifar et al., 2011). This result is also an important result for future research between intelligence and leadership.

[†] The glass ceiling is a concept used to describe the invisible but insurmountable barriers that prevent women from progressing regardless of their achievements (Derin, 2020: 140).

6. CONCLUSION

In this study, the relationship between moral intelligence and ethical leadership behavior was investigated. Also, it was tested whether there is a relationship between the moral intelligence levels of academic leaders and ethical leadership behaviors. Studies on leadership and intelligence in the literature are mostly about emotional intelligence, and a limited number of them are related to cognitive, social, and behavioral intelligence. Based on the assumption that there is a very close relationship between moral intelligence and ethical leadership, the analyzes supported the research question in this study. It was concluded that there is a positive relationship between ethical leadership and moral intelligence. No quantitative research has been found in the literature on these two concepts. But there are qualitative studies between ethical leadership and moral intelligence (Fard, 2012). For this reason, the study will make an important contribution to the literature and will guide the studies in this field.

7. LIMITATIONS

This research has some limitations. The most important is that the sample of the research is limited to academic leaders. Therefore, it cannot be generalized. The study was limited to Turkey. Considering that cultural differences have an effect on morality, different results can be achieved in different countries. Another limit is the work done with academic leaders at a public university.

REFERENCES

- ALKAN, D.P. (2015). "Reliability and Validity Study of the Turkish Version of the Ethical Leadership Scale", *Erciyes Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü Dergisi*, 1 (38): 109-121.
- ALSHAMMARI, A., ALMUTAIRI, N.N. & THUWAINI, S.F. (2015). "Ethical Leadership: The Effect on Employees". *International Journal of Business and Management*, 10(3): 108-116.
- AL-AZZAM, Z.F. (2015). "The Effects of Perceived Transformational Leadership Style and Emotional Intelligence on Enhancing the Effectiveness of Decision Making in Public Health Sector", *International Journal of Advanced Research*, 3 (12): 1665-1682.
- ANTONAKIS, J. ASHKANASY, N.M. & DASBOROUGH, M.T. (2009). "Does leadership need emotional intelligence?" *The Leadership Quarterly*, 20 (2): 247-261.
- ARAS, M. (2021). *Leadership And Leadership Qualities in Chaos Management*. (Ed. Ş. Karabulut). *Yönetim-Strateji-Organizasyon: Teoride ve Uygulamada*, Ankara: Gazi Kitabevi. (pp. 35-49).
- AYDIN, S.İ. (2001). *Managerial Professional and Organizational Ethics*, Ankara: Pegem Yayıncılık.
- BABA, M. M., MAKHDOOMI, U. M., & SIDDIQI, M. A. (2021). Emotional Intelligence and Transformational Leadership Among Academic Leaders in Institutions of Higher Learning, *Global Business Review*, 22(4): 1070-1096.
- BANDURA, A. (1977). *Social Learning Theory*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

- BANDURA, A. (1986). Social foundations of moral thought and action: A social cognitive theory. Englewood Cliffs. NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- BASS, B.M. (2001). Cognitive, social, and emotional intelligence of transformational leaders. In Riggio, R.E., Murphy, S.E. and Priozzolo, F.J. (Eds). Multiple Intelligences and Leadership. NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc. pp. 54-77.
- BEHESHTIFAR, M., ESMAELI, Z., & MOGHADAM, M.N. (2011). Effect of moral intelligence on leadership. European Journal of Economics, Finance and Administrative Sciences, 43(1): 6-11.
- BOSS, J. (1994). The Autonomy of Moral Intelligence, Educational Theory, 44(4): 399-416.
- BOYATZIS, R.E., GOOD, D. & MASSA, R. (2012). "Emotional, Social, and Cognitive Intelligence and Personality as Predictors of Sales Leadership Performance", Journal of Leadership and Organizational Studies, 19(2): 191-201.
- BROWN, M.E., TREVIÑO, L.K. & HARRISON, D.A. (2005). "Ethical leadership: A social learning perspective for construct development and testing", Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 97(2): 117-134.
- BROWN, M.E. & TREVIÑO, L.K. (2006). "Ethical leadership: A review and future directions", The Leadership Quarterly, 17 (6): 595-616.
- CEVİZCİ, A. (2009). Introduction to Philosophy. Bursa: Sentez Yayıncılık.
- CEVİZCİ, A. (2016). Applied Ethics. İstanbul: Say Yayınları.
- CLARKEN, R.H. (2009). Moral Intelligence in the Schools. School of Education. Northern Michigan University. pp. 1-7. Michigan Academy of Sciences, Arts and Letters Wayne State University, Detroit. MI. March 20. 2009.
- ÇENGELCİ, E. (2014). Ethical Leadership Behaviors of School Administrators, Yayınlanmamış Yüksek Lisans Tezi. Afyon: Afyon Kocatepe Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Enstitüsü.
- ÇOBAN, S. & DEMİRHAN, M. (2019). Mobil Bankacılıkta Algılanan Deneysel Değer ve Davranışsal Etkileri: Nevşehir İli Örneği, BMIJ, 7(1): 78-101.
- DE HOOGH, A.H.B. & DEN HARTOG, D.N. (2008). Ethical and despotic leadership, relationships with leader's social responsibility, top management team effectiveness and subordinates' optimism: A multi-method study, The Leadership Quarterly, 19(3): 297-31.
- DERİN, N. (2020). Glass Ceiling Syndrome with Examples Around the World and Turkey, Journal of Individual & Society, 10(2): 137-154.
- DUST, S.B., RESICK, C.J., MARGOLIS, J.A., MAWRIT, M.B. & GREENBAUM, R.L. (2018). "Ethical leadership and employee success: Examining the roles of psychological empowerment and emotional exhaustion", The Leadership Quarterly, 29(5): 570-583.

- EISENBEISS, P.A. & KNIPPENBERG, D.V. (2015). "On ethical leadership impact: The role of follower mindfulness and moral emotions", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 36: 182-195.
- ELLEMERS, N., VAN DER TOORN, J., PAUNOV, Y., & VAN LEEUWEN, T. (2019). "The Psychology of Morality: A Review and Analysis of Empirical Studies Published From 1940 Through 2017", *Personality and social psychology review: an official journal of the Society for Personality and Social Psychology*. Inc. 23(4): 332–366.
- EDELMAN, P. & van KNIPPENBERG, D. (2018). "Emotional intelligence. management of subordinate's emotions, and leadership effectiveness", *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 39(5): 592-607.
- ENGELBRECHT, A. & 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). a3429.
- FADHIL, A.H. et al (2021). "The Role of Leaders' Moral Intelligence to Enhance Strategic Leadership", *Journal of Management and Accounting Studies*, 9(1): 65-78.
- FARD, S.S. (2012). "Ethical Leadership and Moral Intelligence", *Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review (OMAN Chapter)*, 2(5): 103-108.
- FLEW, A. (2005). "Philosophy Dictionary" (Çev. Nurşen Özsoy). Ankara: Yeryüzü Yayınevi.
- FRANKENA, W.K. (1973). "Ethics". Second Edition. N.J.: Prentice-Hall.
- GARG, N., JAIN, A. & PUNIA, B.K. (2021). "Gratitude. social intelligence. and leadership among university teachers: mediation and moderation analysis", *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 29(2): 368-388.
- GÖK, P. (2008). "The Relationship Between Business Ethics and Business Ethics and Factors Affecting Business Ethics in Working Life", *International Journal of Human Sciences*, 5(1): 1-19.
- GÜNDÜZ, T. (2010). "Moral Development and Education in Gifted Children", *Journal of Istanbul University Faculty of Theology*, 1(1): 157-177.
- HAJNCL, L. & VUČENOVIĆ, D. (2020). "Effects of Measures of Emotional Intelligence on the Relationship between Emotional Intelligence and Transformational Leadership", *Psychological topics*, 29(1): 119-134.
- HAQ, S. (2011). Ethics and leadership skills in the public service, *Procedia Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 15, 2792–2796.
- HARTSFIELD, M.K. (2003). "The internal dynamics of transformational leadership: effects of spirituality. emotional intelligence, and self-efficacy", *Dissertation Abstract International Section B: The Sciences and Engineering*, 64: 2440.
- HIGGS, M. (2002). "Do leaders need emotional intelligence?: A study of the relationship between emotional intelligence and leadership of change", *International Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 5(6): 195-212.

- HOFFMAN, B.J. & FROST, B.C. (2006). "Multiple intelligences of transformational leaders: an empirical examination", *International Journal of Manpower*, 27(1): 37-51.
- KALAYCI, Ş. (Ed.) (2008). *SPSS Uygulamalı Çok Değişkenli İstatistik Teknikleri*. Ankara: Asil Yayıncılık.
- KALSHOVEN. K., DEN HARTOG, D. & DE HOOGH, A.H.B. (2011). "Ethical Leader Behavior and Big Five Factors of Personality", *Journal of Business Ethics*, 100(2): 349-366.
- KAMAL, M.Y. et al. (2017). "Emotional Intelligence and Leadership Style", *International Journal of Asian Social Science*, 7(12): 963-970.
- KANOĞLU, M. (2019). *Moral Intelligence*, 2. Baskı. Ankara: Hayat Yayınları.
- KARABEY, T. (2021). "Reflection of Nurses' Moral Intelligence Levels on Care Behaviors", *Perspectives in Psychiatric Care*, 57(5): 1-10.
- KHAMPA, D. (2019). "Development and standardization of moral intelligence scale", *The International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 7(4): 657-665.
- LENNICK. D. & KIEL. F. (2005). "Moral intelligence: Enhancing business performance and leadership success", Boston: Pearson Education. Inc.
- MAHMUTOĞLU. A. (2009). "Ethics and Morals; Similarities. Differences and Relationships", *Türk İdare Dergisi*, 81 (463-464): 225-249.
- MAAMARI, B.E. & MAJDALANI, J.F. (2017). "Emotional intelligence. leadership style and organizational climate". *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, 25 (2): 327-345.
- MAMEDE. C., RIBEIRO. N., GOMES, D. & REGO, A. (2014). "Leader's moral intelligence and employees' affective commitment: the mediating role of transformational leadership", *CD-Rom Proceedings of XXIV Jornadas Luso-Espanholas de Gestão Científica, ESTG-IPL. 6. 7'e 8 de Fevereiro. Leiria*.
- MATHEW, M. & GUPTA, K.S. (2015). "Transformational Leadership: Emotional Intelligence", *SCMS Journal of Indian Management*, 12 (2): 75-89.
- MURADOĞLU, S. & KARABULUT, T. (2020). "A Study on the Mediator Role of Social Intelligence in the Effect of Leaders' Narcissistic Personality Traits on Entrepreneurial Personality Traits", *İstanbul Ticaret Üniversitesi Sosyal Bilimler Dergisi*, 19(39): 1327-1359.
- NEUBERT. M., WU. C. & ROBERTS, J. (2013). "The Influence of Ethical Leadership and Regulatory Focus on Employee Outcomes", *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 23(2): 269-296.
- ÖZLEM, D. (2004). *Ethics: Moral Philosophy*, İstanbul: İnkılâp Yayınevi.
- PANA, L. (2006). "Artificial Intelligence and Moral intelligence", *tripleC*. 4(2): 254-264.
- PIEPER, A. (2012). *Introduction to Ethics* (Çev. Veysel Ataymanand Gönül Sezer). İstanbul: Arıntı Yayınları.

- ROSETE, D. & CIARROCHI, J. (2005). "Emotional intelligence and its relationship to workplace performance outcomes of leadership effectiveness". *Leadership and Organization Development Journal*, 26(5): 388–399.
- RIGGIO, R.E., MURPHY, S.E. & PIROZZOLO, F.J. (2002). *Multiple Intelligences and Leadership*. NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates. Inc.
- SHAHID, M. N. (2017). "Social Intelligence and Effective Leadership: Content Analysis Approach", *Asia Pacific Journal of Emerging Markets*, 1(1): 35–46.
- TABACHNICK, B. G. and FIDELL, L. S. (2013). *Using multivariate statistics*. Boston: Pearson.
- TAMER, G. (2021). "The Role of Ethical Leadership in Increasing Employees' Organizational Commitment and Performance: The Case of Healthcare Professionals", *Journal of Life Economics*, 8(1): 123-146.
- TANNER, C. & CHRISTEN, M. (2014). "Moral Intelligence-A Framework for Understanding Moral Competence". Christen M., van Schaik C., Fischer J., Huppenbauer M., Tanner C. (eds) *Empirically Informed Ethics: Morality between Facts and Norms* (p. 119-136). *Library of Ethics and Applied Philosophy*. vol 32. Switzerland: Springer.
- TREVÍÑO, L.K. (1986). "Ethical decision-making in organizations: a person–situation interactionist model", *Academy of Management Review*, 11: 601–617.
- TREVÍÑO, L.K., BROWN, M. & HARTMAN, L.P. (2003). "A qualitative investigation of perceived executive ethical leadership: Perceptions from inside and outside the executive suite", *Human Relations*, 56(1): 5-37.
- YAKUT, S. & YAKUT, I. (2021). "Yakut- Moral Intelligence Scale". *Uluslararası Sosyal Araştırmalar Dergisi*, 76(14): 836-842.
- YUKL, G.A. (2002). *Leadership in organizations* (5th ed.). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.
- ZHU, W. (2008). "The Effect of Leadership on Follower Moral Identity: The Mediating Role of Psychological Empowerment", *Leadership Review*, 8: 62-73.