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Ethical Leadership: A Study of Behaviors of Leaders in Higher Education Today

Abstract
The primary purpose of this study is to identify the behaviors of an ethical leader as perceived by tenured and tenure-track faculty at a research university (RU/VH) in the southeastern portion of the United States. The authors utilized a researcher-designed survey instrument consisting of twenty possible behaviors attributed to an ethical leader as well as selected demographic characteristics. The majority of respondents were male (66.20%) and tenured (75.00%). The largest group were Full Professors (49.60%) and had been at the study institution for less than 10 years (38.20%). The age and gender of the respondents significantly impacted the findings – older respondents and those that were identified as female had stronger perceptions of the behaviors of an ethical leader in higher education as measured by higher mean responses, based on a Likert scale, to statements in the survey that pertained to types of ethical behavior. Since female faculty seemed to have more clearly focused perceptions regarding the behaviors of an ethical leader, the researcher recommends that the University increase the emphasis on diversity (especially gender diversity) in all aspects of the organization. The increased diversity would include increasing the number of females hired in the tenure-track position, having more females in key committees (especially those formed to hire university leaders), and promoting more females to serve in senior executive positions.

Introduction
Leadership is a fundamental aspect of successfully developing organizational employees and achieving the goals of an organization. Positive leadership unites employees, creates high morale, and furthers the organization’s productivity in terms of quality products and services.
Gini specified that leadership sets the “tone” and “shapes the behavior of all those involved in organizational life” (Gini, 2004, p. 26). Gini pointed out the way followers are influenced by observing their leaders and expressed that leaders acting and performing in a way to demonstrate a “positive role model” to their followers commonly referred to as “leading by example,” is one of the most powerful and implicit methods of providing behavioral expectations to followers (Gini, 2004). According to Bawden and Northouse, to demonstrate ethical behavior, society must understand and promote the concepts of respecting others and fairness (Bawden, 2003; Northouse P., 2004).

The Role of Leadership in a higher education institution is to both promote the institution and to actively shape the future of society. The President of Amherst College (Jacob Abbott), the President of Union College (Eliphalet Nott), the President of University of Vermont (James Marsh), the President of Brown University (Francis Wayland), and former Harvard University Professor (George Ticknor) were among the first to establish standards under which the early higher education system could be operative in an ethical manner (Rudloph, 1990; Cohen, 1998).

Wong (1998) noted that societies today should not only expect but demand a strong ethical leadership in higher education institutions. Wong wrote “Values-based leadership influences the culture of the organization and, advocates contend, is better equipped to bring about lasting change” (Wong, 1998, p. 115). It is extremely important to understand and emulate the behaviors of an ethical leader for the betterment of organizations and the development of followers of leaders. Various researchers have emphasized this point in different ways:

- Burns acknowledged that it is imperative for organization leaders to adhere to ethics to be successful in resolving the various issues which occur in their organizations (Burns J. M., 1978/2003).
- Ciulla indicated in the article Leadership and the Ethics of Care that “the job of a leader includes caring for others, or taking responsibility for them (Ciulla J. B., 2009, p. 3).
- Shareef and Atan (2019) found ethical leadership to be positively related to organizational citizenship behavior and inversely related to turnover of personnel.
- Wong stated that society has a high expectation of ethical leadership in higher education systems. (Wong, 1998). Leadership in higher education can influence many others, especially college students who can apply what they see as actions of role models throughout their lives. Ghasemy, Akbarzadeh and Gaskin (2021) showed that ethical academic leadership behavior was a significant predictor of positive citizenship comportment at the departmental level.

Making ethical decisions requires an ability to select a proper ethical response when presented with multiple choices. The Josephson Institute of Ethics has established a world-renowned organization founded on the values they refer to as the “Six Pillars of Character” (Josephson, 2001) as shown in Figure 1. These “Six Pillars of Character” are “trustworthiness, respect, responsibility, fairness, caring, and good citizenship (responsible participation in society)” (Josephson, 2001, p. 5).
Several leadership researchers have observed a decline in ethical leadership. These scholars argue that “our nation is in a leadership crisis, one that requires more and better leadership in all areas of our society” (Eich, 2008, p. 176). Society has heard of a significant number of leaders in higher education who have conducted unethical behavior and violated the laws of the United States. These have resulted in the terminating of university presidents, removal of university board members, the termination of sports directors, and tenured faculty (Wolverton, 2012; Jaschik, 2015). Leaders who practice unethical leadership can ultimately produce a negative influence on those who they are designated to lead. Yukl voiced that by “making unethical practices appear to be legitimate, a leader can influence other members of the organization to engage in crimes of obedience” (Yukl G., 2010, p. 408).

Josephson (2001) delineates two issues in ethics. The first issue involves the competence to understand what is right from what is wrong. The second is a person’s commitment and desire to “do what is good and proper” (Josephson, 2001, p. 2). Many researchers such as Kouzes
and Posner (1993) have related ethics to leadership effectiveness due to their “perceptions of the leader's honesty, integrity, and trustworthiness” (Brown & Trevino, 2006, p. 596).

Five of the most important theories establishing ethical frameworks for leadership are Authentic Leadership, Charismatic Leadership, Transformational Leadership, Servant Leadership, and Learning Styles Theory.

- Authentic Leadership is one of the most recently explored topics in leadership theory and, “... is about the authenticity of leaders and their leadership” (Northouse P. G., 2016, p. 195). There are several definitions depending on three viewpoints: intrapersonal perspective, interpersonal perspective, and developmental perspective.

- Charismatic Leadership Theory was originally set forth by (House, 1976) who wrote that this type of leaders has “charismatic” influence on their followers. House identified some traits and behaviors as “dominant, having ardent desire to influence others, being self-confident, and having a strong sense of one’s own moral values” (Northouse P. G., 2016; House R., 1976).

- Transformational Leadership aims to change and transform followers. Transformational Leaders are interested in “emotions, values, ethics, standards, and long-term goals” (Northouse P. G., 2016, p. 162). This leadership style influences followers to move toward a goal and achieve above and beyond what is typically expected of them. Kouzes and Posner (2002) composed a model of Transformational Leadership that included “five fundamental practices that enabled leaders to get extraordinary things accomplished: model the way, inspire a shared vision, challenge the process, enable others to act, and encourage the heart” (Northouse P. G., 2016, pp. 174-175) refer to Figure 2.

Figure 2: The Five Fundamental Practices of Transformational Leadership (Kouzes & Posner, 1995)

- Servant Leadership defines the role of the leader as a servant to their followers. These leaders exhibit a true care and concern for their followers referred to as caring principles
by Northouse (Northouse P. , 2004). Greenleaf held that the servant leader is focused “primarily on the growth and well-being of people and the communities to which they belong” (Robert K. Greenleaf Center for Servant Leadership, 2016).

It is vitally important to understand that many leaders probably will exhibit the various behaviors of more than one leadership theory.

The primary purpose of this study was to determine the behaviors of an ethical leader as perceived by tenured and tenure-track faculty at a Research University/Very High Research Activity (RU/VH) in the southeastern portion of the United States. This is reflected in the following objectives:

1) To describe tenure status faculty at a RU/VH on the following selected demographic characteristics:
   a) Age;
   b) Rank;
   c) Years at the study institution;
   d) Gender;
   e) Tenure Status.

2) Identify the behaviors of an ethical leader as perceived by tenured and tenure-track faculty at a RU/VH in the southeastern portion of the United States.

3) Determine if a relationship exists between the perceived behaviors of an ethical leader and the following demographic characteristics:
   a) Age;
   b) Rank;
   c) Years at the study institution;
   d) Gender;
   e) Tenure Status.

4) Determine if a model exists that explains a significant portion of the variance in perceived behaviors of an ethical leader from the following demographic characteristics:
   a) Age;
   b) Rank;
   c) Years at the study institution;
   d) Gender;
   e) Tenure Status.

**Methodology**

The sample for this study included one hundred percent (100%) of the tenured and tenured-track faculty at the selected research university in the southeastern portion of the United States in the fall of the 2017-2018 academic year.

The authors utilized a researcher-designed instrument. The content validity of this instrument was established through a review by a panel of experts in the field of leadership and revisions were made based on their feedback. The instrument was divided into three sections. The first section contained links to a cover letter and study information sheet as well as the author-defined terms. The second section presented twenty possible behaviors of an ethical leader. Participants were provided with the following response options: strongly disagree, disagree, slightly disagree, neither agree nor disagree, slightly agree, agree, and strongly agree. These options corresponded to a seven-point Likert scale. The last section consisted of demographic questions that assessed a variety of personal characteristics.
The authors obtained permission from the Institutional Review Board (IRB) at a RU/VH in the southeastern portion of the United States before the survey was distributed. The survey was distributed through the Qualtrics® online survey software. An e-mail containing the IRB required informed consent information was sent to all participants requesting that they complete the survey. Follow-ups occurred weekly for three weeks giving the participants a total of four weeks to complete the survey. A total of 274 respondents provided usable responses.

**Findings**
The major findings of this study are discussed by the respective objectives.

**Objective One**
Objective one was to describe tenured and tenure-track faculty members at a RU/VH on the following selected demographic characteristics: Age, Rank, Years at the study institution, Gender, and Tenure Status. Useable responses were received from 274 (27.57%) of these faculty members. The largest group reported their age as being in the 40-49 year category (n = 75, 27.70%). The smallest group reported their age as being in the 20-29 year category (n = 1, 40%). The largest group reported their rank as being a Professor (n = 135, 49.60%). The smallest group reported their rank as an Associate Professor (n = 66, 24.30%). The largest group reported their years of service at the study institution as being in the 0-9 year’s category (104, 38.20%). The smallest group reported their years of service at the study institution as being in the 40 and above category (n = 5, 1.80%). Of the 272 responding faculty members, 92 (33.80%) identified as a female and 180 (66.20%) identified as a male. Of the 272 responding faculty members, 204 (75.00%) identified as tenured and 68 (25.00%) identified as not tenured but on tenure track.

**Objective Two**
The second objective of the study was to identify the behaviors of an ethical leader as perceived by tenured and tenure-track faculty at a RU/VH in the southeastern portion of the United States. Of the twenty possible behaviors of an ethical leader, respondents identified the highest rated behavior as “Accepts Responsibility” with a mean of 6.810 (SD = .633) based on a seven-point Likert Scale. Respondents identified the second highest rated behavior as “Accepts Constructive Criticism” with a mean of 6.440 (SD = .968). Respondents identified the third highest rated behavior as “Respect for Subordinates” with a mean of 6.420 (SD = .925). Respondents identified the lowest rated behavior as “Respect for Authority” with a mean of 5.420 (SD = 1.402). Complete findings regarding perceived ethical behaviors are found in Table 1 below:

**Table 1: Behaviors of an Ethical Leader as Perceived by Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty at a RU/VH in the Southeastern Portion of the United States**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Standard Deviation</th>
<th>Interpretive Category</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Accepts Responsibility</td>
<td>271 a</td>
<td>6.810</td>
<td>0.633</td>
<td>Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accepts Constructive Criticism</td>
<td>271 a</td>
<td>6.440</td>
<td>0.968</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect for Subordinates</td>
<td>269 b</td>
<td>6.420</td>
<td>0.925</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect for Others</td>
<td>268 c</td>
<td>6.410</td>
<td>0.946</td>
<td>Agree</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Two underlying constructs were identified in the scales using factor analysis:

- An overall Behaviors Interactional Values sub-scale score was computed as the mean of nine items in the sub-scale. The mean of these scores was 6.33 (SD = .767), and the value, based on a Likert scale, ranged from 1.00 to 7.00.

- An overall Behaviors Personal Values sub-scale score was computed as the mean of the eleven items that belong to that sub-scale. The mean of these scores was 5.98 (SD = .817), and the values, also based on a Likert scale, ranged from 1.00 to 7.00.

The results of the factor analysis are found in the following Table 2. Factor analysis is a statistical method used to describe variability among observed, correlated variables in terms of a potentially lower number of unobserved variables. In this study, they are called factors of Behaviors of an Ethical Leader as Perceived by Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty at a RU/VH in the Southeastern Portion of the United States.

### Table 2: Factor Analysis regarding Behaviors of an Ethical Leader as Perceived by Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty at a RU/VH in the Southeastern Portion of the United States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sub-scale - Interactional Values</th>
<th>Factor 1 Loadings</th>
<th>Factor 2 Loadings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Respect for Others</td>
<td>0.868</td>
<td>0.206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect for Subordinates</td>
<td>0.839</td>
<td>0.206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect for Students</td>
<td>0.804</td>
<td>0.254</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect for Faculty</td>
<td>0.780</td>
<td>0.320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Respect for Peers</td>
<td>0.772</td>
<td>0.369</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Three participants did not respond to this item.

Five participants did not respond to this item.

Six participants did not respond to this item.

Four participants did not respond to this item.

Seven participants did not respond to this item.
Note: 49.296% of variance explained by the extracted factors.

**Objective Three**

The third objective was to determine if a relationship exists between the perceived behaviors of an ethical leader and the following demographic characteristics: Age, Rank, Years at the study institution, Gender, and Tenure Status. A total of two variables were included in these analyses, specifically the Behaviors Interactional Values and the Behavior Personal Values sub-scales identified in the previous objective.

**Age** - Both dependent variables were found to have a statistically significant relationship with the variable age as shown in the following Table 3.

**Table 3: Relationship between Perceived Behaviors and Age of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty at a RU/VH in the Southeastern Portion of the United States**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviors Values Sub-Scale Scores</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>int</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behaviors Personal Values Scores</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>0.16</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviors Interactional Values Scores</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>0.10</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>L</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Kendalls’ Tau Correlation Coefficient

*b Interpretive Scale: .70 or higher = very strong relationship (V); .50-.69 = substantial relationship (S); .30-.49 = moderate relationship (M); .10-.29 = low relationship (L); and .09 or lower = negligible relationship (N) (Davis, 1977).

**Rank** - Neither dependent variable was found to have a statistically significant relationship with the variable rank as shown below in Table 4.
Table 4: Relationship between Perceived Behaviors and Rank of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty at a RU/VH in the Southeastern Portion of the United States.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviors Values Sub-Scale Scores</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behaviors Interactional Values Scores</td>
<td>2, 267</td>
<td>1.444</td>
<td>0.296</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviors Personal Values Scores</td>
<td>2, 266</td>
<td>1.331</td>
<td>0.372</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Years at Study Institution - Neither dependent variable was found to have a statistically significant relationship with the variable “years at the study institution” as shown below in Table 5.

Table 5: Relationship between Perceived Behaviors and Years at the Study Institution of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty at a RU/VH in the Southeastern Portion of the US

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviors Values Sub-Scale Scores</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>r</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>int b</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behaviors Personal Values Scores</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>0.087</td>
<td>0.065</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviors Interactional Values Scores</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>0.029</td>
<td>0.534</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Kendall’s Tau Correlation Coefficient.
b Interpretive Scale: .70 or higher = very strong relationship (V); .50-.69 = substantial relationship (S); .30-.49 = moderate relationship (M); .10-.29 = low relationship (L); and .09 or lower = negligible relationship (N) (Davis, 1977).

Gender – The dependent variable “Behaviors Interactional Values Score” was found to have a statistically significant relationship with the demographic “Gender.” In the variable Behaviors Interactional Values Score (t268 = 3.29, p = .001), females had a mean of 6.708 (SD = .454) while males had a mean of 6.241 (SD = .876).

Tenure Status - Neither of the sub-scale scores was found to be significantly different by categories of the variable tenure status. Results for both gender and tenure status are shown in Table 6.

Table 6: Relationship between Perceived Behaviors and Gender & Tenure Status of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty at a RU/VH in the Southeastern Portion of the United States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behaviors Values Scores</th>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behaviors Interactional Values Scores</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>6.508</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>178</td>
<td>6.241</td>
<td>3.289</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviors Personal Values Scores</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>6.100</td>
<td>1.666</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>0.097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>5.925</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Values Scores</td>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>201</td>
<td>6.021</td>
<td>1.242</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>.215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tenure-Track</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>5.879</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behaviors Personal Values Scores</td>
<td>Tenured</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>6.343</td>
<td>0.420</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>.675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tenure-Track</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>6.298</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Note: Equal variances not assumed.
Objective Four
The fourth objective of this study was to determine if a model exists that explained a significant portion of the variance in perceived behaviors of an ethical leader from the following demographic characteristics age, rank, years at the study institution, gender, and tenure status. Both of the sub-scale scores were found to have a significant explanatory model. Examination of the data revealed that the highest correlation with Behaviors Interactional Values Scores was with the variable of “Gender” ($r = -0.154$, $p = 0.006$). Overall, two of the seven independent variables were found to be significantly related to Behaviors Interactional Values Scores. “Gender” was the first variable entered into the regression model with an R square of 0.024 ($p = 0.012$), which explained 2.4% of the variance of the Behaviors Interactional Values Scores. The second variable that entered in the regression model was “Age.” With an R square change of 0.041 ($p = 0.017$). These two variables explained 4.1% of the variance in Behaviors Interactional Values Scores. The data related to this model are found below on Table 7.

Table 7: Multiple regression analysis of Behaviors Interactional Values Scores on Selected Demographic Characteristics of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty at a RU/VH in the Southeastern Portion of the United States

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.779</td>
<td>5.586</td>
<td>0.004</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>0.318</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>266</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>R Square Change</th>
<th>F Change</th>
<th>Sig. F. Change</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients Beta</th>
<th>Variables Not in Equation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>6.442</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>-0.174</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>4.642</td>
<td>0.032</td>
<td>0.131</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Examination of the data revealed that the highest correlation with Behaviors Personal Values Scores was the variable of “Age” ($r = -.214$, $p = < .001$). Overall, three of the seven independent variables were found to be significantly related to Behaviors Personal Values Scores. “Age” was the first variable that entered the regression model with an R square of 0.046 ($p = < .001$) and explained 4.6% of the variance of the Behaviors Personal Values Score. The second variable that entered in the regression model was “Gender” with an R square change of 0.013.
These two variables explained 5.9% of the variance in Behaviors Personal Values Scores. The data related to this model are found below on Table 8.

**Table 8: Multiple Regression Analysis of Behaviors Personal Scores on Selected Demographic Characteristics of Tenured and Tenure-Track Faculty at a RU/VH in the Southeastern Portion of the United States**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of Variation</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>MS</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.807</td>
<td>8.214</td>
<td>&lt;.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>263</td>
<td>0.463</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>265</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Model Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>R Square Change</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig. F. Change</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients Beta</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>0.046</td>
<td>12.713</td>
<td>&lt; .001</td>
<td>0.231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>3.591</td>
<td>0.059</td>
<td>-0.115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Variables Not in Equation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rank - Associate</td>
<td>-1.133</td>
<td>0.258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank - Professor</td>
<td>0.943</td>
<td>0.347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank - Assistant</td>
<td>0.351</td>
<td>0.726</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure Status</td>
<td>0.281</td>
<td>0.779</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Years of service at same university</td>
<td>-0.220</td>
<td>0.826</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Conclusions, Implications, and Recommendations**

Based on the findings from this study, the authors developed the following conclusions, implications, and recommendations:

**Conclusion One**

Underlying constructs were found in the ratings of the behaviors of an ethical leader as perceived by tenure status faculty.

Factor analysis identified two underlying constructs found in the ratings. These constructs were used to compute two sub-scales. The first sub-scale extracted was Interactional Values and contained nine behaviors identified as the following:

1) Respect for Others (Factor Loading = .868),
2) Respect for Subordinates (Factor Loading = .839),
3) Respect for Students (Factor Loading = .804),
4) Respect for Faculty (Factor Loading = .780),
5) Respect for Peers (Factor Loading = .772),
6) Accepts Responsibility (Factor Loading = .525),
7) Accepts Criticism (Factor Loading = .520),
8) Leads by Example (Factor Loading = .504), and
9) Good Listener (Factor Loading = .484).

For exploratory research Kou, Anderson, Tatham, and Black (2006) suggested that the minimum acceptable loading criterion may be as low as .30. Loadings of .40 are considered more important and significant. Loadings of .50 are considered practically significant. These behaviors are an essential part of an individual’s extrinsic nature reflecting their core beliefs regarding their interaction with others.

The second sub-scale extracted was Personal Values and contained the following eleven items were found to be practically significant:

1) Respect for Authority (Factor Loading = .753),
2) Professional Excellence (Factor Loading = .740),
3) Creates a vision for others to follow (Factor Loading = .637),
4) Obey the Rules (Factor Loading = .634),
5) Strives to Serve (Factor Loading = .627),
6) Inspires Others (Factor Loading = .572),
7) Practicing Academic Values (Factor Loading = .568),
8) Respect Property (Factor Loading = .507),
9) Exhibits Character (Factor Loading = .478),
10) Maintains Confidentiality (Factor Loading = .437), and
11) Public Interest Ahead of Self (Factor Loading = .375)

These behaviors are an essential part of an individual’s intrinsic nature reflecting their core beliefs regarding their core inner persona. For example, a person who obeys societal norms, creates a vision for others to follow, and strives to serve could reasonably be expected not to fail others regardless of the personal sacrifice or consequences.

One might assume that, by following the afore-mentioned behaviors, trust is generated through credibility and that collaboration is garnered through trust, Solomon (2003) elucidated that “without trust there can be no cooperation, no community, no commerce, no conversation. And in a context without trust, of course, all sorts of emotions readily surface, starting with suspicion, quickly escalating to contempt, resentment, hatred, and worse” (Solomon, 2003, p. 207).

Gini specified that leadership sets the “tone” and “shapes the behavior of all those involved in organizational life” (Gini, 2004, p. 26). Gini pointed out the way followers are influenced by observing their leaders and expressed that leaders acting and performing in a way to demonstrate a “positive role model” to their followers commonly referred to as “leading by example,” is one of the most powerful and implicit methods of providing behavioral expectations to followers (Gini, 2004). Many researchers including Northouse and Yukl found that under most circumstances, leaders possess an abundance of authority over followers and greater opportunity to influence them.

Based on this conclusion, the authors recommend that further research be conducted to the extent that the behaviors of an ethical leader may be more measurable so they can help in identifying the traits that match the aims and goals of an institution of higher education. Furthermore, the authors recommend the development of an instrument that could be presented to applicants of an organization requesting their participation in the self-reporting of their behaviors, whereby an analysis can be performed between the self-reported behaviors and the behaviors that are can reasonably be expected of an employee of any organization.
that promotes an ethical culture. Such a culture would result in an organization that encourages the success and development of its employees and future organizational leaders. It can reasonably be expected that applicants of organizations which promote this type of culture possess behaviors including but not limited to: leading by example, respect for other, accepts responsibility, and inspires others.

**Conclusion Two**

One of the two most predictive demographics characteristic of the perceived behaviors of an ethical leader is the age of the faculty.

This conclusion is based on the following findings of the study. A total of two variables were included in this analysis. Factor analysis was conducted imputing the variables Behaviors Personal Values Scores and Behaviors Interactional Values Scores. According to respondents, the nature of the relationship with the variables Behaviors Personal Values Scores ($r = .16$) and Behaviors Interactional Values Scores ($r = .10$) was such that individuals who were older tended to have higher sub-scale scores. Examination of this data revealed that the highest correlation with Behaviors Personal Values Scores was the variable of “Age” ($r = -.214, p = < .001$). “Age” was the only variable that entered into the regression model with an R square of $.075$ ($p = < .001$). “Age” explains 7.5% of the variance of the Behavior Interactional Values Scores. The nature of the influence of this variable was such that older participants tended to have higher Behavioral Interactional Values Scores.

It is interesting to note that even though age was significantly related to perceived behaviors of an ethical leader, years of experience at the study institution was not related to these measures. This is not particularly surprising since many individuals who enter academia do so after a sometimes lengthy career in their chosen field. For example, an individual may become an engineering professor after they have been a professional engineer for a considerable number of years. Therefore, an individual's age and their years of experience at a university (especially a one specific university) may have little correlation to one another. Therefore, the factor that would seem to be relevant to a person's perceptions of the behaviors of an ethical leader would seem to be a person's life experiences more so than their experiences in academia at one specific institution.

Therefore, based on this conclusion, the authors recommend that if an institution has a high priority for hiring individuals into an institution who have a clear set of ethical standards and beliefs, those institutions should look carefully at individuals that have more life experiences. Certainly, the authors are not recommending the institutions exercise age discrimination in any form, but rather look very seriously at a person's years of life experiences as a potential advantage in building a faculty with clearly defined ethical standards. Although years of experience at the study institution did not have any significant correlation with age, one explanation could be that the responding faculty members had clearer understanding of perceived behaviors of an ethical leader in their minds.

**Conclusion Three**

Female faculty more strongly agreed with the proposed behaviors of an ethical leader than male faculty.
This conclusion is based on the following findings of the study. The two identified underlying constructs for each of the behaviors of an ethical leader were an interactional scale and personal scale. Of the 272 responding faculty members, 92 (33.80%) identified as a female and 180 (66.20%) identified as a male. A total of two variables were included in this analysis. Of these two variables, Behaviors Interactional Values Scores was found to be significantly different by categories of the demographic “Gender” ($t_{268} = 3.29, p = .001$); females had a mean of 6.708 ($SD = .454$) while males had a mean of 6.241 ($SD = .876$). Additionally, results of the Multiple Regression Analysis utilizing Behaviors Interactional Values Scores as the dependent variable revealed that “Gender” entered the model as a significant contributor to the regression model. The nature of the influence of these variables was such that female participants tended to have higher Behaviors Interactional Values Scores than males. Results of the Multiple Regression Analysis utilizing Behaviors Personal Values Scores as the dependent variable demonstrated that “Gender” also entered this model as a significant explanatory factor. Female participants tended to have higher scores on the Behaviors Personal Values Scores measure than males in this model as well.

Based on this conclusion, the authors recommend that additional research be conducted to further examine the possible influencing factors that produce these gender differences. This research should be conducted as focus groups with male and female groups conducted separately. The primary emphasis in these focus groups should logically take the form of not only identifying the perceived behaviors of ethical leaders, but more importantly to identify factors that led to the perceptions that they hold. These focus groups should be drawn from the respondents in this study that had the highest level of agreement in one focus group and those with the lowest level of agreement in the other focus group and replicated for the male and female responding faculty.

**Conclusion Four**
Rank did not influence perceptions of the behaviors of ethical leaders.

This conclusion is based on the following findings of the study. A total of two leadership subscale scores were compared by the categories, of the variable rank. None of these comparisons was found to be significant.

However, it could be reasonably expected that due to most age groups being represented within each of the three rank categories of Professor, Associate Professor, and Assistant Professor the anticipation that rank had an effect on the varying ranks’ perceptions of the behaviors of an ethical leader could be nullified. Since faculty enter academia at a wide variety of ages, considerable diversity in age levels exists at all of the tenure-track faculty ranks. Some individuals complete doctorates in their twenties, while others wait until they are in their forties or even older to complete their doctorate. Therefore, a program could easily have a 28-year-old assistant professor and a 52-year-old assistant professor.

Therefore, one could reasonably expect that the 52-year-old assistant professor would have a better understanding of the behaviors of an ethical leader based upon life experiences, which should closely resemble the professor’s perceptions of the behaviors of an ethical leader based upon their life’s experiences.
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