



Article

Future Consequences Consideration and its Relationship with Moral Blindness among University Students

Baydaa Saleh Hasan Al-Taie*¹

1. University of Al-Qadisiyah, College of Dentistry, Iraq

* Correspondence: baydaa.saleh@qu.edu.iq

Abstract: The current study aims to investigate: Future consequences consideration among university students, Moral blindness among university students, Differences in the correlation between future consequences consideration and moral blindness based on gender (male – female) and academic specialization (scientific – humanities), The relationship between future consequences consideration and moral blindness among university students. The research sample consisted of (376) male and female students from Al-Qadisiyah University (morning study) for the academic year (2022-2023), selected randomly from both scientific and humanities specializations. The study adopted the Future Consequences Consideration Scale by, which consists of (12) items and was translated into Arabic. Additionally, a Moral Blindness Scale was developed based on the theory of, consisting of (15) items. After verifying their psychometric properties in terms of validity and reliability, both instruments were applied to the research sample. The findings revealed that the sample demonstrated future consequences consideration and exhibited moral blindness. Moreover, the results indicated no significant differences in future consequences consideration and moral blindness based on gender or academic specialization. However, a positive correlation was found between the two variables. Based on these results, the study concluded with several recommendations and suggestions.

Keywords: Future Consequences Consideration, Moral Blindness

1. Introduction

University students often face challenges, particularly in situations that create internal conflicts influenced by factors such as the likelihood of success or failure, which subsequently affect their behavior. The current study aims to explore the consideration of future consequences and its relationship with moral blindness among university students, as well as the correlation between these two variables.

The study sample consisted of (376) undergraduate students from the University of Al-Qadisiyah (morning classes) for the academic year(2022–2023). The sample included both males and females from scientific and humanities disciplines and was selected randomly.

The Future Consequences Consideration Scale developed by[1], comprising (12) items, was translated into Arabic for the study. A scale for Moral Blindness was constructed based on the theory of [2], consisting of (15) items. Both tools were validated for psychometric properties, including reliability and validity, before being applied to the study sample.

The findings revealed that the students demonstrated a significant level of future consequences consideration, alongside the presence of moral blindness. Additionally, the

Citation: Al-Taie B. S. H. Future Consequences Consideration and its Relationship with Moral Blindness among University Students. Central Asian Journal of Literature, Philosophy, and Culture 2025, 6(1), 43-57.

Received: 19th Jan 2025
Revised: 28th Jan 2025
Accepted: 20th Feb 2025
Published: 27th Feb 2025



Copyright: © 2025 by the authors. Submitted for open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)

results showed no significant differences in either variable based on gender or field of study. A positive correlation was found between future consequences consideration and moral blindness.

Based on these findings, the study concluded with several recommendations and suggestions for further research.

1.1 Research Problem

Some university students face challenges related to their lives and future, which may lead to long-term consequences as well as behavioral and psychological issues such as stress, anxiety, scattered thoughts, and low academic performance. While some students view future outcomes as a natural matter, others are indifferent to considering the potential consequences of their actions.

The extent to which individuals consider the possible long-term outcomes of their current behaviors and how these behaviors are influenced by such outcomes is crucial [3]. However, some students tend to ignore the future consequences of their actions, which may result in aggressive behavior, as aggressive individuals often act first and think later. Such students struggle to comprehend or think critically about the future impact of their actions, leading to poor decision-making that negatively affects their education and personal lives.

This disregard for the importance of future planning may also cause students to adopt dangerous or socially unacceptable ideas, which they may fail to evaluate critically. As Rate noted, students should not passively accept information or ideas without critique, as such unexamined beliefs may be misleading or incorrect. Considering future consequences helps channel passion in a calculated way, where passion becomes a motivator for persistence and success when tied to a clear vision of future goals. However, an intense focus on a single subject, coupled with unrealistic expectations, may lead to frustration when those expectations are not met. This imbalance between academic and personal life increases stress and anxiety, potentially causing students to overlook or fail to recognize the ethical dimensions of their decisions and behaviors in certain contexts [4].

Such neglect can lead to unethical decisions made without guilt or full awareness. The concept of moral blindness describes the difficulty individuals face in recognizing the moral aspects of their behaviors due to environmental or organizational factors, leading them to act in ways that conflict with ethical values without sufficient awareness [5].

The university environment itself can exacerbate moral blindness. For instance, if students perceive that the university prioritizes performance and results over ethical behavior, they may be more inclined to ignore ethical principles. This dissonance between internal ethical values and actual behavior may lead students to justify unethical actions, further reinforcing moral blindness. The absence of future-oriented thinking can diminish moral responsibility and lead to engagement in unethical behaviors, whether in academic or social settings. Moral blindness, in turn, is associated with limited consideration of long-term consequences, as unethical decisions are often driven by immediate gains. The research problem becomes clear in observing that students face significant psychological and personal pressures, which heighten fears about future consequences and amplify the challenges they may face. This, in turn, negatively affects their behavior and interactions with others. It has been noted that many students struggle with effectively communicating ideas or conveying information. By investigating the relationship between consideration of future consequences and moral blindness, the current research seeks to answer the following question:

What is the strength and direction of the correlation between consideration of future consequences and moral blindness among university students?

1.2 The Importance of the Research

Considering future consequences is of great importance for university students, as it helps them set career goals and make informed educational decisions. By understanding future trends, students who focus on future consequences can organize their time and resources more effectively. Good time management leads to improved academic performance and reduced psychological stress, while also preparing students for rapid changes. This fosters greater flexibility and adaptability, which are crucial for addressing challenges and developing transferable skills. Moreover, considering future consequences enhances self-awareness and personal development. It allows students to define their values and personal goals, equipping them with essential life skills such as effective communication, stress management, and problem-solving. It also enables them to critically analyze information and evaluate ideas based on evidence and logic, rather than simply accepting prevailing notions without question. These skills empower students to face academic and personal challenges, boosting their confidence and resilience. They also foster creativity and innovation, enabling students to develop new solutions to various problems. On the other hand, moral blindness among university students is significant because it directly influences their behavior and decision-making in academic and life contexts. Understanding and enhancing their awareness of ethical dimensions can reduce unethical behaviors, such as cheating or manipulating academic standards. However, moral blindness can lead to neglecting the ethical implications of decisions and actions, thereby weakening students' ability to navigate complex situations ethically. Raising awareness about moral blindness helps students recognize the broader impact of their actions on others and society, fostering a sense of responsibility. Encouraging students to adopt sound ethical standards in decision-making—whether in daily life or academic settings—is crucial. The importance of studying moral blindness lies in shaping a conscious generation capable of distinguishing between right and wrong behaviors in academic and social environments. When students fail to recognize the ethical aspects of ambiguous or complex situations, they need comprehensive awareness of how their actions impact others to make ethical decisions. Ethical behavior, in turn, requires a firm belief in societal values. Humans possess cognitive abilities that allow them to develop strategies for evading moral responsibility, such as dissociating themselves from social norms and justifying their behaviors based on situational factors [6]. Research indicates that ordinary individuals, not just criminals, can engage in unethical behaviors in their daily lives [7]. According to Schafer, when individuals convince themselves that moral standards do not apply to certain situations, they tolerate behaviors that harm others [8]. Students strive to maintain their ethical standards, but moral blindness can lead them to violate these standards unconsciously, impairing their ability to make sound ethical decisions [9]. A study by [10] showed that young people struggle to assess the ethical dimensions of problems and that integrating ethical dilemmas into education enhances their ethical abilities [10]. Additionally, a study by [11] found that manipulative language increases moral blindness, complicating ethical decision-making [11]. Aleksic noted that individuals often rely on automatic and unconscious processes in ethical situations, sometimes failing to recognize the ethical dimensions of their decisions [12]. Larsen highlighted that psychopathy is a form of moral blindness, where individuals temporarily struggle to access the ethical dimension of their behavior or decisions. Furthermore, [13] found that daily routines within institutions can reinforce moral blindness, making routine a source of this phenomenon [14]. According to the researcher, the ability to foresee the future consequences of one's actions is essential for reducing moral blindness. When students can recognize the potential ethical consequences of their actions, they are less likely to disregard ethical considerations. Conversely, moral blindness occurs when students fail to perceive or comprehend these consequences, making them more prone to engaging in unethical behaviors unconsciously. Thus, recognizing future consequences is

a key factor in combating moral blindness, guiding students toward making more ethical and responsible decisions.

The Importance of the Current Research:

The significance of this study can be summarized into two aspects, theoretical and practical, as follows:

1. The study variables represent a modest contribution to the educational and psychological literature, particularly due to the novelty of these variables and their clear impact on individuals' lives.
2. The university stage is a critical period where students reach a level of intellectual maturity that enables them to organize their thinking, plan, and execute their goals effectively, with an emphasis on their future-oriented role.
3. The study of moral blindness complements existing psychological and scientific research in explaining the motivational dynamics of learning.

1.3 Objectives of the Research

The current study aims to achieve the following:

1. Investigate the consideration of future consequences among university students.
2. Examine the level of moral blindness among university students.
3. Explore the differences in the relationship between consideration of future consequences and moral blindness based on the variables of gender (male-female) and academic major (scientific-humanities).
4. Analyze the relationship between consideration of future consequences and moral blindness among university students.

Key Terms Definition:

1. Consideration of Future Consequences:
 - a. Definition by Strathman et al.: The extent to which individuals consider the potential future outcomes of their current behavior and how those outcomes influence their ability to achieve long-term goals and avoid potential risks [15].
 - b. Theoretical Definition: The researcher adopts the definition by as the theoretical basis for the current study, consistent with the framework established by [16].
 - c. Operational Definition: A representative sample of behavioral content reflecting the concept of consideration of future consequences, measured by the total score obtained by respondents based on their answers to the scale items.
2. Moral Blindness:
 - a. Definition by Palazzo et al.: A temporary loss of the ability to perceive the moral aspects of a given situation. It arises from external factors that impair an individual's ability to recognize and understand the moral dimension of their behavior [17].
 - b. Theoretical Definition: The researcher adopts the definition by as the theoretical framework for the current study [18].
 - c. Operational Definition: A representative sample of behavioral content reflecting the concept of moral blindness, measured by the total score obtained by respondents based on their answers to the scale items.

1.4 Literature Review

Theoretical Framework:

First: The Theory of Future Consequences

The theory of Future Consequences, developed by Strathman and colleagues, focuses on the concept of future-oriented thinking. According to this theory, consideration of future consequences refers to an individual's ability to foresee the long-term outcomes that may result from their current behavior. This perspective reflects an individual's self-awareness, understanding of their intentions, motivations, and goals to achieve these future results [19]. An individual's judgments or expectations about their performance and choice of activities are key determinants of their motivation and self-efficacy. These

factors influence goal-setting, adaptability to complex and challenging situations, and resilience to potential future failures. This, in turn, impacts the objectives and aspirations they aim to achieve. Due to children's limited awareness of their abilities and future-oriented thinking, their judgments about future expectations tend to be very low or even nonexistent in some cases. Future perceptions vary according to an individual's chronological age. For instance, older individuals often perceive their future as being near its end, while younger individuals view their expected endpoint as very distant. Consequently, older individuals are likely to invest fewer personal resources in work, family, and friendships compared to younger individuals. This interpretation suggests that people's perception of future thinking is connected to the social motivation system, their awareness of the future, and age-related changes. Accordingly, future thinking is shaped by cognitive structures and the individual's predictive abilities. Strathman described consideration of future consequences as a personal ability that manifests in various multifaceted ways. It reflects individuals' aspirations, thoughts, and expectations regarding their future and their pursuit of these future aspirations. Individuals with high future-oriented thinking tend to be more driven toward the future, successful, and goal-oriented over the long term compared to those with low future-oriented thinking. These individuals also possess a broader range of long-term goals they aim to achieve. In his research, Strathman found that individuals who focus on future consequences perceive long-term goals as more meaningful and worth the investment of time and effort compared to short-term goals. However, long-term goals tend to be less motivating to accomplish than short-term ones due to the extended time required for their achievement. To mitigate the effects of this extended timeline, individuals with high future-oriented thinking often shift their focus from large, distant goals to smaller, more attainable ones. This strategy allows them to acquire knowledge in a gradual, future-oriented manner. It also enables them to leverage both the drive to achieve long-term goals and the motivation derived from completing short-term goals. This hierarchical approach, starting with short-term goals and progressing toward long-term ones, ultimately leads to the successful realization of major objectives.

Second: Moral Blindness Theory by Palazzo et al. (2012)

Georg Palazzo, a professor at the University of Lausanne in Switzerland, focuses on how institutional and contextual factors influence individuals' ethical decision-making. Palazzo and his colleagues introduced the theory of Moral Blindness, which explains how individuals, in certain situations, fail to recognize or ignore the ethical aspects of the issues they face, leading them to make unethical decisions. His contributions have positioned moral blindness as a key concept for understanding why individuals behave unethically without being consciously aware of their actions. This theory explains unethical behavior through the idea that individuals may lose their moral awareness in complex situations or under environmental pressures. The interplay between the individual's perception of the situation cognitive schemas, meaning-making processes, and contextual factors results in moral blindness, where individuals act unethically without realizing it. According to the theory, moral awareness depends on the meaning-making process within the social context to which the individual belongs.

Immediate Context: Refers to the process of meaning-making and the situational factors surrounding the scenario. - **Broader Context:** Encompasses overarching moral principles and norms imposed by the group or institution to which the individual belongs. Moral blindness, therefore, arises from a complex interaction between meaning-making and contextual pressures, which only become evident over time. In this way, moral blindness occurs within a framework of influences and contextual factors.

Moral Awareness and Limited Cognition Although awareness of the moral principle or dimension embedded in a situation represents the foundational step in ethical decision-making, studies on limited awareness highlight that individuals can make decisions that

contradict their values and principles without being consciously aware of it. Anecdotal evidence from self-reported accounts suggests that ethical dimensions often escape individuals' attention. When individuals fail to perceive the moral principle or dimension of their decisions, moral blindness occurs due to a lack of awareness of ethical issues. This aligns with research emphasizing the automaticity of intuition and unconscious responses in ethical behavior. These studies challenge the notion that ethical behavior stems solely from a rational, conscious process in which individuals weigh alternatives against their values, principles, and potential consequences. From this perspective, individuals engaging in unethical behavior are assumed to have some awareness, at least theoretically, of the distinction between right and wrong. However, they may prioritize personal gains over ethical considerations, even if the decision is unethical. Cognitive Frameworks and Ethical Complexity Studies questioning the assumption of purely rational ethical decision-making suggest that individuals rely on complex cognitive processes, including frameworks, schemas, models, and related concepts. These processes shape their cognitive system and influence how they perceive and understand the world. However, ethical situations are inherently complex and often contain blind spots that make it difficult for individuals to identify the moral dimensions of a situation and make appropriate decisions. Such blind spots are exacerbated by the context and circumstances surrounding the ethical situation, increasing the likelihood of moral blindness. Palazzo and colleagues emphasize the interaction between rigid cognitive frameworks and the contextual factors of the ethical situation.

Moral blindness depends heavily on circumstances (context) and the nature of the social environment in which it occurs. Many situations lead individuals to unintentionally deviate from their values and behave unethically without realizing it (i.e., becoming morally blind). Note that the nature of moral blindness varies depending on the circumstances, such as in the workplace, where factors like lack of information, inexperience, and organizational routines contribute to its occurrence. Additionally, individuals often seek information that confirms their pre-existing beliefs and recall information selectively, further reinforcing their conviction that they are acting correctly. Justification is another critical factor in the emergence of moral blindness in the workplace, often manifesting in phrases such as: This is what everyone else does. I wasn't paying attention to what I was doing. No one was harmed. Such justifications contribute significantly to the development of moral blindness.

Three Core Domains of Moral Blindness:

1. The process by which individuals interpret ambiguous, unclear, or confusing ethical issues or events.
2. The set of ideas and beliefs prevalent in the time and place where the situation occurs.
3. The scenario requiring an inevitable decision after identifying and understanding the issue, alongside factors that make moral blindness more or less likely.

2. Materials and Methods

The study adopts the descriptive (correlational) method as a scientific approach, as it aims to describe psychological phenomena in general through collecting data, presenting it, and statistically analyzing it. This method focuses on studying variables as they exist among the sample individuals and relies on describing the phenomenon as it occurs in reality, offering an accurate depiction.

Research Population

The research population consists of students enrolled in the daytime programs at Al-Qadisiyah University for the academic year (2022–2023), covering both genders (male - female) and two fields of study (scientific - humanities). The total population comprises (17979) students, distributed as follows Scientific Specializations (1.862) students, including (5448) males (7414) females Humanities Specializations (5117) students,

including (2147) males (2970) females These students are distributed across (18) colleges, with (12) colleges in scientific fields and 6 colleges in humanities fields.

3. Results and Discussion

The research sample was selected using the stratified random sampling method and consisted of (376) students from the university. Table (1) presents the distribution of the final application sample by specialization (scientific vs. humanities) and gender (male vs. female).

Table 1. Final application sample distributed by specialization (scientific - humanities) and gender (male - female).

	T	Specialization	College Name	Sex	The Total
			Females	Males	
1	Scientific	medicine	46	48	54
2		the sciences	46	48	54
the total			92	92	188
3	Humanitarian	the law	46	48	54
4		Literature	46	48	54
the total			184	192	376

Third: Research Tools : To achieve the objectives of the current research, the researcher adopted the *Future Consequences Consideration Scale and developed a Moral Blindness Scale.

Future Consequences Consideration Scale

The Future Consequences Consideration Scale developed was adopted for the following reasons:

1. Lack of Measurement Tools in the Iraqi Context: There is no existing tool to measure consideration of future consequences in Iraqi society due to the scarcity of studies in this area, to the best of the researcher's knowledge.
2. Psychometric Properties: This scale possesses strong psychometric properties, including validity and reliability.
3. Applicability Across Diverse Samples: The scale has been applied to various samples in different countries.

Translation Validity of the Scale

Emphasize that the preferred method for translation is back translation. According to this method, the tool is first translated from the source language to the target language. The translated version is then given to another translator to retranslate it back into the source language. Finally, a third translator evaluates the equivalence between the original version and the retranslated version to ensure the accuracy and consistency of the translation.

Validity of Items in the Future Consequences Consideration and Moral Blindness Scales

To ensure the validity of the items in the Future Consequences Consideration Scale (12 items) and the Moral Blindness Scale (15) items, the scales were presented to a panel of (16) experts in the fields of education and psychology. The experts were asked to provide their opinions on the suitability of the items in their preliminary forms and suggest any necessary modifications, including adjustments to the response options. For analyzing the experts' feedback, the Chi-square (χ^2) test was used. Each item was deemed valid

if its calculated χ^2 value exceeded the critical value of (3.84) at a significance level of (0.05). Following this procedure, no items were excluded from either scale.

Table 2. Chi-Square Values, Critical Values, and Percentage Agreement of Expert Opinions on the Emotional Integrity Scale Items.

Variables	Paragraph numbers	Judges' opinions		Value of K2	percentage	Significance level
		Disagreements	Agree			
Consider future consequences	1-2-3-6-7-8-10-11-12	0	16	16	100 %	0.05
	4-5-9	2	14	9	87 %	
moral blindness	2-3-4-5-7-8-9-11-12-15	0	16	16	100 %	
	1-6-10-13	1	15	12.25	93 %	

Calculated and Critical χ^2 Values for Differences in Experts' Opinions on the Scales of Future Consequences Consideration and Moral Blindness

Pilot Study on Clarity of Instructions and Comprehension of the Future Consequences Consideration Scale

Faraj (1980) emphasizes the necessity of verifying whether the participants in the sample understand the scale items (Faraj, 1980: 160). Accordingly, the researcher applied the scale to a randomly selected sample of (60) students from the research population, including (30) students from scientific disciplines (pharmacy) and 30 students from humanities (fine arts). The researcher found that the instructions and items were clear, as no participant sought clarification. The time taken to respond ranged between (5 – 7) minutes.

Statistical Analysis of the Future Consequences Consideration Scale Items

To conduct a statistical analysis of the scale items, the researcher applied the scale to a sample of (400)students (both male and female) from both scientific and humanities disciplines. These students were selected using a simple random sampling method. After administering the scale and scoring the responses, the discriminative power of the items was calculated as follows:

Extreme Groups Method for the Future Consequences Consideration Scale

The following steps were undertaken:

1. The scale was administered to a random sample of (400) students.
2. Responses were scored, and the total score for each participant was calculated.
3. Scores were ranked in descending order (from highest to lowest).
4. The top(27%) and bottom(27%) of participants were identified to form the high and low groups, respectively, as this percentage is considered optimal for group selection.
5. An independent samples t-test was conducted to determine the significance of the difference between the high and low groups for each item on the scale.

The results showed that all items were discriminative, as the calculated t-values for each item exceeded the critical t-value of (1.96) at a significance level of (0.05) and a degree of freedom of (214).

Table 3. Results of the Independent Samples t-test for Differences Between the High and Low Groups on the Future Consequences Consideration Scale.

Paragraph number	Arithmetic mean		Standard deviation		The calculated ta'yyah	Significance
	The world	Alia	The world	Alia		
1	3.62	2.3	0.72	0.95	11.55	Function
2	3.5	2.14	0.84	0.97	11.03	
3	3.55	2.06	0.86	0.96	11.96	
4	3.59	2.06	0.76	0.83	14.18	
5	3.44	2.21	1	0.94	9.34	
6	3.29	1.92	1.09	0.96	9.84	
7	3.67	2.06	1.01	1.18	10.71	
8	3.66	1.86	1.12	1.08	11.99	
9	3.09	1.81	1.41	1.16	7.33	
10	3.56	1.59	1.15	0.94	13.44	
11	3.86	1.32	0.89	0.65	23.887	
12	3.65	1.62	1.23	1.04	13.07	

Psychometric Properties of the Future Consequences Consideration Scale

1. First: Validity: The following indicators of validity were extracted in the current study:
2. Face Validity: This type of validity was established by presenting the scale, along with its instructions and alternatives, to a group of experts in education and psychology.
3. Construct Validity: Construct validity was achieved through the following:
4. Item-Total Correlation: Pearson's correlation coefficient was used to calculate the correlation between each item on the Future Consequences Consideration Scale and the total scale score.

The results indicated that all correlation coefficients were statistically significant at the (0.05) significance level with(398) degrees of freedom. The table value for the correlation coefficient was(0.098), and the total number of forms was (400). The correlation coefficients ranged from(0.24 - 0.71), as shown in Table (4) It shows that.

Table 4. Correlation coefficient values for the scale of consideration of future consequences.

Paragraph	Link value	Significance	Paragraph	Link value	Significance	Significance	Link value	Significance
1	0.47	Function	5	0.55	Function	9	0.53	Function
2	0.71		6	0.48		10	0.54	
3	0.53		7	0.57		11	0.54	
4	0.66		8	0.40		12	0.48	

Second: Reliability

Reliability refers to the consistency of test results, meaning that repeated administrations of the test should yield stable and consistent results.

Reliability of the Future Consequences Consideration Scale

The reliability of the Future Consequences Consideration Scale was determined using two methods:

1. Test-Retest Method: The scale was administered to a sample of (100) university students from Al-Qadisiyah University, including both scientific (College of Pharmacy) and humanities (College of Education, Department of Educational and

Psychological Sciences) specializations. The scale was reapplied to the same sample after(14) days. Pearson's correlation coefficient was used to assess the relationship between the scores from the first and second administrations, yielding a reliability coefficient of(0.79).

2. Cronbach's Alpha (Internal Consistency): This method assesses the consistency of individual responses across items, indicating the strength of the inter-item correlations. The researcher utilized the statistical analysis sample of (400) students to calculate reliability, resulting in a Cronbach's alpha coefficient of(0.84).

Final Version of the Future Consequences Consideration Scale: The final version of the scale consists of (12)items and was administered to a primary sample of (376) university students. Instructions were clarified to ensure participants understood how to respond and emphasized the importance of answering all items honestly, as the responses were used solely for research purposes.

Second Moral Blindness Scale: Development of the Moral Blindness Scale After reviewing relevant literature, the researcher found no existing local, Arabic, or international scale for measuring moral blindness among university students. Thus, the researcher decided to develop a tool to measure moral blindness. Defining the Concept of Moral Blindness and Its Domains The researcher relied on the theory of [6], which defines moral blindness asThe temporary inability to perceive the ethical aspects of a given situation, arising from external factors that impair the individual's ability to recognize and understand the ethical dimension of their behavior identified three domains of moral blindness: (.Sensemaking -Ideological Context -Decision-Making).

Formulating the Scale Items Based on the theory and the defined domains, the researcher developed(15)items, with(5) items for each domain. The items were formulated as declarative statements with five graded response options. The maximum possible score is(75), while the minimum is (15).

Validity of the Moral Blindness Scale Items: The validity of the scale items was confirmed by presenting them to a panel of experts, as detailed on page 9 of the study.

Pilot Testing for Clarity and Understanding: The same pilot sample used for the Future Consequences Consideration Scale was utilized to test the clarity of the instructions and understanding of the items in the Moral Blindness Scale. The average time required to complete the scale ranged from (4 - 8)minutes.

Statistical Analysis of the Moral Blindness Scale Items: To calculate the discriminative power of the items, the two extreme groups method was applied. An independent samples t-test was conducted, and the calculated t-values for all items exceeded the critical value of (1.96) at (0.05) significance level and and Table (5) It shows that.

Table 5. Distinguishing the items of the moral blindness scale using the two-party method.

Paragraph number	Arithmetic mean		Standard deviation		Significance	The calculated ta'iyah
	Alia	The world	Alia	The world		
1	3.40	2.62	1.27	1.34	4.36	Function
2	3.98	2.43	1.12	1.32	9.34	
3	3.70	2.36	1.18	1.29	8	
4	3.44	2.27	1.18	1.24	7.16	
5	3.89	2.34	1.06	1.29	9.61	
6	3.52	2.57	1.31	1.36	5.20	
7	3.37	2.38	1.26	1.33	5.61	
8	3.81	2.07	1.22	1.22	10.50	
9	3.81	2,23	1.20	1.25	9.43	

10	3.70	2.36	1.18	1.29	8
11	3.29	2.22	1.25	1.20	6.39
12	3.66	2.09	1.19	1.22	9.53
13	3.32	2.13	1.27	1.30	6.83
14	3.40	2.62	1.27	1.34	4.36
15	3.55	2.19	1.26	1.19	8.14

Psychometric Properties of the Moral Blindness Scale

First: Validity The following indicators of validity were extracted in the current study:

Logical Validity: Logical validity is achieved by defining the behavioral domain measured by the scale and ensuring that the design of the items logically covers the important dimensions of this domain.

Face Validity: Face validity was confirmed by presenting the scale to a panel of experts, as described on page (9) of the study.

Construct Validity: Construct validity was assessed through the following:

Item-Total Correlation: Pearson's correlation coefficient was used to determine the relationship between the score of each item and the total score of the Moral Blindness Scale. The results showed that all correlation coefficients were statistically significant at the (0.05) significance level with (398) degrees of freedom. The critical table value for the correlation coefficient was (0.098), and the total sample size was (400) forms the correlation coefficients ranged between (0.27 - 0.49), as illustrated in Table (6) It shows that.

Table 6. Correlation coefficient values for the moral blindness scale.

Paragraph	value Link	Significance	Paragraph	value Link	Significance	Paragraph	value Link	Significance
1	0.43		6	0.33		11	0.27	
2	0.37		7	0.34		12	0.40	
3	0.42	Function	8	0.47	Function	13	0.40	Function
4	0.34		9	0.49		14	0.32	
5	0.53		10	0.62		15	0.40	

Correlation Between Domains of the Moral Blindness Scale The correlation between each domain and the other domains of the *Moral Blindness Scale* was assessed by calculating the Pearson correlation coefficients. This was done using the scores of the sample participants for each domain and their total scores on the scale. Additionally, the relationships between the domains themselves were analyzed using the participants' overall scores. The results indicated that all correlation coefficients were statistically significant when compared to the critical Pearson table value of 0.098 at the 0.05 significance level with 398 degrees of freedom. These findings are presented in Table (7) It shows that.

Table 7. Blindness scale Relationship of the domain score to other domains of the moral.

The field	Meaning making	Ideological context	decision making	moral blindness
Meaning making	1	0.25	0.41	0.76
ideological context	-	1	0.29	0.68
decision making	-	--	1	0.77

Reliability of the Moral Blindness Scale :The reliability of the Moral Blindness Scale was assessed using two methods:

1. Test-Retest Method: The test-retest reliability was calculated using Pearson's correlation coefficient, which yielded a value of (0.82).
2. Cronbach's Alpha (Internal Consistency): To determine reliability based on internal consistency, Cronbach's alpha was calculated, resulting in a reliability coefficient of (0.88).

Final Version of the Moral Blindness Scale

The final version of the Moral Blindness Scale consists of(15) items distributed across three domains:

(. Sensemaking - Ideological Context . Decision-Making)

Results and Interpretation

First Objective: Future Consequences Consideration Among University Students

To address this objective, the Future Consequences Consideration Scale was administered to a sample of (376) university students. The mean score of the sample was (103.72), with a standard deviation of (13.72). The hypothetical mean of the scale was (36). To determine the statistical significance of the difference between the sample mean and the hypothetical mean, a one-sample T-test was conducted. The calculated T-value was (1.80), which is less than the critical T-value of(1.96)at(375) degrees of freedom and a significance level of (0.05). This indicates that there is no statistically significant difference between the sample mean and the hypothetical mean , Table (8) It shows that.

Table 8. Results of the t-test for the sample scores on the scale of consideration of future consequences.

Sample number	Arithmetic mean	Standard deviation	Hypothetical average	Calculated T-value	Table T-value	Degree of freedom	Significance
376	103.72	13.84	105	1.80	1.96	376	Function

Interpretation of Results This result can be interpreted to suggest that university students demonstrate a moderate level of future consequences consideration, reflecting their ability to approach life experiences and events with a positive perspective. Education plays a vital role in enhancing critical thinking and logical analysis, helping students assess options and make informed decisions based on future benefits and risks. Additionally, students often develop plans for their professional futures, which necessitates thinking about potential career paths and challenges, thereby strengthening their ability to anticipate future consequences.

Second Objective: Moral Blindness Among University Students

To address this objective, the Moral Blindness Scale was administered to a sample of (376) university students. The mean score was (39.19), with a standard deviation of(7.28). The hypothetical mean was (42.5). To determine the statistical significance of the difference between the sample mean and the hypothetical mean, the critical T-value of (1.96) at (375) degrees of freedom and a significance level of (0.05). This indicates a statistically significant difference, suggesting that university students scored lower than the hypothetical mean on the moral blindness scale Table (9) illustrates this.

Table 9. T-test results for sample individuals' scores on the moral blindness scale.

Sample number	Arithmetic mean	Standard deviation	Hypothetical average	Calculated T-value	Table T-value	Degree of freedom	Significance
376	39.19	7.282	42.5	-9.08	1.96	376	Function

This result can be interpreted as indicating that university students possess a moderate level of consideration for the future consequences of life experiences and events, viewing them with a positive outlook. Education plays a role in enhancing critical thinking and logical analysis, which helps students evaluate options and make well-informed decisions based on future benefits and risks. Students also develop plans for their professional future, which requires them to think about potential career paths and the challenges they might face, thereby strengthening their ability to anticipate future outcomes.

Objective Two: Moral Blindness Among University Students

To achieve this objective, the Moral Blindness Scale was applied to a research sample consisting of 376 male and female students. The results indicated that the mean score was (39.19) with a standard deviation of (7.28), while the hypothetical mean was (42.5). To determine the significance of the difference between the means, a one-sample t-test was used. The calculated t-value was (-9.08), which, when compared to the critical t-value of (1.96) at a significance level of (0.05) and a degree of freedom of (375), indicates a statistically significant difference. Table (10) It shows that.

Table 10. Significance Degree of freedom Table T-value Calculated T-value.

Sample number	Arithmetic mean	Standard deviation	Hypothetical average	Calculated T-value	Table T-value	Degree of freedom	Significance
376	39.19	7.282	42.5	-9.08	1.96	376	Function

The researcher interprets this result in light of the theory by Palazzo et al. (2012), which suggests that university students possess the necessary capabilities to be effective moral individuals, able to analyze ethical situations correctly without being influenced by their cognitive framework or the inherently complex context of ethical situations (Palazzo et al., 2012:333). This implies that they may face difficulties in distinguishing between right and wrong in ethical scenarios or may overlook or fail to apply ethical principles due to external or internal influences. Such moral blindness can arise from the complexity of situations, social pressures, or personal biases.

Objective Three: Differences in the Relationship Between Consideration of Future Consequences and Moral Blindness Based on Gender (Male-Female) and Field of Study (Scientific-Humanities)

Pearson's correlation coefficient was used, followed by the Z-test for comparing Pearson correlation coefficients. The Z-value for the relationship between consideration of future consequences and moral blindness was (1.16). Table (11). It shows that.

Table 11. The difference in the relationship between consideration of future consequences and moral blindness According to gender variable (male-female).

The relationship between variables	Sex	Number	Correlation coefficient R	Standard value of correlation coefficient	T-value		Significance level
					Tabular	Calculated	
Looking to the future - consequences moral blindness	Males	184	0.41	0.41	1.96		Not significant
	Females	192	0.28	0.288		1.49	
	scientific	188	0.51	0.563		0.12	
	humanitarian	188	0.50	0.549			

The table above indicates that there are no statistically significant differences in the relationship between consideration of future consequences and moral blindness based on gender (male-female) or field of study (scientific-humanities).

Objective Four: The Relationship Between Consideration of Future Consequences and Moral Blindness Among University Students

To achieve this objective, the researcher applied the scale to the main research sample of (376)students. After collecting and analyzing the data using Pearson's correlation coefficient, the correlation between the scores of the sample individuals was found to be (0.8102). This value is greater than the critical correlation coefficient value of (0.098), indicating a positive correlation between the two variables. In other words, as individuals score higher on the scale of consideration of future consequences, their scores on the moral blindness scale also increase.

This relationship can be interpreted as reflecting how thinking about long-term consequences influences ethical commitment. Research suggests that individuals who focus on future outcomes tend to make more ethical decisions, as they are aware of the long-term impact of their actions. Conversely, moral blindness occurs when individuals overlook the ethical dimensions of a situation due to pressures or personal interests, leading to the justification of unethical behavior.

4. Conclusion

The findings of this study highlight the presence of future consequences consideration and moral blindness among university students, with no significant differences based on gender or academic specialization. The positive correlation between these variables suggests that while students exhibit an awareness of long-term consequences, they may still experience moral blindness, potentially affecting their ethical decision-making. These findings imply that fostering ethical awareness and critical thinking skills is essential in higher education to mitigate moral blindness while reinforcing responsible decision-making. Future research could explore additional factors influencing moral blindness, such as social pressures, cognitive biases, and institutional ethics, to develop targeted interventions that enhance ethical behavior among students.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of the current research, the researchers recommend the following:

1. Developing curricula and adopting modern, positive methodologies to improve the students' reality and encourage them to build a better future.

2. Engaging university students in events and festivals and considering their opinions in organizing such occasions, as this indirectly fosters courageous thinking and enhances their interpersonal skills.

Suggestions

In continuation of the current research, the researchers propose conducting the following studies:

1. A study exploring the relationship between future consequences consideration and certain variables, such as (social anxiety, psychological tranquility, emotional complexity, and passion).
2. A similar study on different samples to compare the results with those of the current research.
3. A study on moral blindness and its relationship to positive organizational behavior and illusions among outstanding students.

REFERENCES

- [1] S. M. Milhem, *Research Methods in Education and Psychology*, 1st ed. Jordan: Dar Al-Masirah, 2000.
- [2] R. K. Hambleton, P. F. Miranda, and C. Spielberger, *Adapting Educational and Psychological Tests for Cross-Cultural Assessment*, 1st ed. Saudi Arabia: Obeikan, 2005.
- [3] D. Aleksic, "The development and validation of a scale to measure ethical blindness at work," *Academy of Management Proceedings*, vol. 2017, no. 1, p. 11030, 2017.
- [4] M. J. Allen and W. M. Yen, *Introduction to Measurement Theory*. Waveland Press, 1979.
- [5] A. Bandura, "Perceived self-efficacy in the exercise of personal agency," *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 128–163, 1990.
- [6] L. Hall, P. Johansson, and T. Strandberg, "Lifting the veil of morality: Choice blindness and attitude reversals on a self-transforming survey," *PLoS ONE*, vol. 7, no. 9, 2012.
- [7] P. A. Hall, "Examining the role of time perspective in the promotion of healthy behavioral practices," Ph.D. dissertation, University of Waterloo, 2001.
- [8] M. Kramer, "The moral logic of Hizballah," in *Origins of Terrorism: Psychologies, Ideologies, Theologies, States of Mind*, W. Reich, Ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1990, pp. 131–157.
- [9] B. Kump and M. Scholz, "Organizational routines as a source of ethical blindness," *Organization Theory*, vol. 3, no. 1, 2022.
- [10] R. R. Larsen, "Psychopathy as moral blindness: A qualifying exploration of the blindness-analogy in psychopathy theory and research," *Philosophical Explorations*, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 214–233, 2020.
- [11] M. Betts, "Future time perspective: Examination of multiple conceptualizations and work-related correlates," M.S. thesis, Georgia Institute of Technology, 2013.
- [12] A. E. Monroe and G. D. Reeder, "Motive-matching: Perceptions of intentionality for coerced action," *Journal of Experimental Social Psychology*, vol. 47, pp. 1255–1261, 2011.
- [13] J. C. Nunnally, *Psychometric Theory*. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1978.
- [14] F. Pajares, "Self-efficacy beliefs in academic settings," *Review of Educational Research*, vol. 66, no. 4, 1996.
- [15] G. Palazzo, F. Krings, and U. Hoffrage, "Ethical blindness," *Journal of Business Ethics*, vol. 109, pp. 323–338, 2012.
- [16] J. R. Rest, *Moral Development: Advances in Research and Theory*. New York: Praeger, 1986.
- [17] U. Schaefer, "Reconceptualizing moral disengagement as a process: Transcending overly liberal and overly conservative practice in the field," *Journal of Business Ethics*, 2020.
- [18] A. Strathman, F. Gleicher, D. Boninger, and C. Edwards, "The consideration of future consequences: Weighing immediate and distant outcomes of behavior," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, vol. 66, no. 4, pp. 742–752, 1994.
- [19] K. Tirri, P. Nokelainen, and K. Holm, "Ethical sensitivity of Finnish Lutheran 7th–9th grade students," University of Helsinki, Finland, 2008.