

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

Jonathan Hubchen

Samuel L. Wyatt

Michael Burnett

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.valpo.edu/jvbl>



Part of the [Educational Assessment, Evaluation, and Research Commons](#), [Educational Leadership Commons](#), and the [Higher Education Administration Commons](#)

This Peer-Reviewed Article is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Business at ValpoScholar. It has been accepted for inclusion in The Journal of Values-Based Leadership by an authorized administrator of ValpoScholar. For more information, please contact a ValpoScholar staff member at scholar@valpo.edu.



JONATHAN HUBCHEN
BATON ROUGE, LA, USA



SAMUEL WYATT
SHREVEPORT, LA, USA



MICHAEL F. BURNETT
BATON ROUGE, LA, USA

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 (Rudolph, 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).

Figure 1: Six Pillars of Character (Josephson, 2001); Retrieved from Old Bridge Township

CHARACTER	COLOR	DESCRIPTION
TRUSTWORTHINESS	Blue: Think True Blue	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be honest • Don't deceive, cheat or steal • Be reliable--do what you say you'll do • Have the courage to do the right thing • Build a good reputation • Be loyal--stand by your family, friends and country
RESPECT	Yellow/Gold: Think the Golden Rule	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Treat others with respect; follow the Golden Rule • Be tolerant of differences • Use good manners, not bad language • Be considerate of the feelings of others • Don't threaten, hit or hurt anyone • Deal peacefully with anger, insults and disagreements
RESPONSIBILITY	Green: Think being responsible for a garden of finances; or as in being solid and reliable like an oak	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do what you are supposed to do • Persevere: keep on trying! • Always do your best • Use self-control • Be self-disciplined • Think before you act--consider the consequences • Be accountable for your choices
FAIRNESS	Orange : Think of dividing an orange into equal sections to share fairly with friends	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Play by the rules • Take turns and share • Be open-minded; listen to others • Don't blame others carelessly
CARING	Red : Think of a heart	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Be kind • Be compassionate and show you care • Express gratitude • Forgive others • Help people in need
CITIZENSHIP	Purple : Think regal purple as representing the state	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Do your share to make your school and community better • Cooperate • Get involved in community affairs • Stay informed; vote • Be a good neighbor • Obey laws and rules • Respect authorities • Protect the environment

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 tenure-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

Behavior	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Interpretive Category
Accepts Responsibility	271 ^a	6.810	0.633	Strongly Agree
Accepts Constructive Criticism	271 ^a	6.440	0.968	Agree
Respect for Subordinates	269 ^b	6.420	0.925	Agree
Respect for Others	268 ^c	6.410	0.946	Agree

Behavior	N	Mean	Standard Deviation	Interpretive Category
Maintains Confidentiality	269 ^b	6.410	0.983	Agree
Respect for Students	269 ^b	6.390	0.943	Agree
Respect for Peers	269 ^b	6.330	0.925	Agree
Respect for Faculty	269 ^b	6.300	1.017	Agree
Public Interest Ahead of Self	268 ^c	6.280	0.951	Agree
Strives to Serve	269 ^b	6.200	1.023	Agree
Leads by Example	269 ^b	6.190	1.057	Agree
Good Listener	269 ^b	6.140	1.098	Agree
Practicing Academic Values	268 ^c	6.110	1.099	Agree
Exhibits Character	269 ^b	6.100	1.174	Agree
Respect for Property	269 ^b	6.030	1.092	Agree
Obeys the Rules	269 ^b	5.910	1.217	Agree
Inspires Others	270 ^d	5.890	1.249	Agree
Professional Excellence	269 ^b	5.820	1.181	Agree
Creates a vision for others to follow	268 ^c	5.820	1.213	Agree
Respect for Authority	267 ^e	5.420	1.402	Somewhat Agree

^a Three participants did not respond to this item.

^b Five participants did not respond to this item.

^c Six participants did not respond to this item.

^d Four participants did not respond to this item.

^e Seven participants did not respond to this item.

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 a 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

Sub-scale - Interactional Values	Factor 1 Loadings	Factor 2 Loadings
Respect for Others	0.868	0.206
Respect for Subordinates	0.839	0.206
Respect for Students	0.804	0.254
Respect for Faculty	0.780	0.320
Respect for Peers	0.772	0.369

Sub-scale - Interactional Values	Factor 1 Loadings	Factor 2 Loadings
Accepts Responsibility	0.525	0.077
Accepts Constructive Criticism	0.520	0.172
Leads by Example	0.504	0.444
Good Listener	0.484	0.453
Respect for Authority	0.124	0.753
Professional Excellence	0.286	0.740
Creates a vision for others to follow	0.200	0.637
Obeys the Rules	0.001	0.634
Strives to Serve	0.284	0.627
Inspires Others	0.531	0.572
Practicing Academic Values	0.274	0.568
Respect for Property	0.355	0.507
Exhibits Character	0.203	0.478
Maintains Confidentiality	0.199	0.437
Public Interest Ahead of Self	0.358	0.375

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

Behaviors Values Sub-Scale Scores	<u>N</u>	<u>r</u> ^a	<u>p</u>	<u>int</u> ^b
Behaviors Personal Values Scores	268	0.16	0.001	L
Behaviors Interactional Values Scores	269	0.10	0.029	L

^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.

Behaviors Values Sub-Scale Scores	<u>Df</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>
Behaviors Interactional Values Scores	2, 267	1.444	0.296
Behaviors Personal Values Scores	2, 266	1.331	0.372

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

Behaviors Values Sub-Scale Scores	<u>N</u>	<u>r</u> ^a	<u>p</u>	<u>int</u> ^b
Behaviors Personal Values Scores	269	0.087	0.065	N
Behaviors Interactional Values Scores	270	0.029	0.534	N

^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).

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 ($t_{268} = 3.29$, $p = .001$), females had a mean of 6.708 ($SD = .454$) while males had a mean of 6.241 ($SD = .876$).

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

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

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” ($r = -.154$, $p = .006$). 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 .024 ($p = .012$), 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 .041 ($p = .017$). 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

ANOVA					
Source of Variation	df	MS	F	p	
Regression	2	1.779	5.586	0.004	
Residual	264	0.318			
Total	266				
Model Summary					
Model	R Square	R Square Change	F Change	Sig. F. Change	Standardized Coefficients Beta
Age	0.024	0.024	6.442	0.012	-0.174
Gender	0.041	0.017	4.642	0.032	0.131
Variables Not in Equation					
Variables	t			p	
Rank - Professor	0.918			0.359	
Rank - Assistant	-0.798			0.425	
Tenure Status	-0.725			0.469	
Years of service at same university	-0.718			0.473	
Rank - Associate	-0.336			0.737	

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 .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 .013

($p = .059$). 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

ANOVA					
Source of Variation	df	MS	F	p	
Regression	2	3.807	8.214	<.001	
Residual	263	0.463			
Total	265				
Model Summary					
Model	R Square	R Square Change	F Change	Sig. F. Change	Standardized Coefficients Beta
Age	0.046	0.046	12.713	< .001	0.231
Gender	0.059	0.013	3.591	0.059	-0.115
Variables Not in Equation					
Variables		t		p	
Rank - Associate		-1.133		0.258	
Rank - Professor		0.943		0.347	
Rank - Assistant		0.351		0.726	
Tenure Status		0.281		0.779	
Years of service at same university		-0.220		0.826	

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 $\pm .40$ are considered more important and significant. Loadings of $\pm .50$ 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) Obeys 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 for 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.

References

- Bawden, R. (2003). Valuing the epistemic in the search for betterment: The nature and role of critical learning systems. In G. Midgley (Ed), *Critical systems thinking and systemic perspectives on ethics, power and pluralism*: (Vol. 4, pp. 175-194). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Brown, M. E., & Trevino, L. K. (2006). Ethical leadership: A review and future directions. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 17(6), 595-616.
- Burns, J. M. (1978/2003). The structure of moral leadership. In J. Ciulla, *The ethics of leadership* (pp. 219-228). Belmont, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.
- Ciulla, J. B. (2009). Leadership and the Ethics of Care. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 88, 3-4. doi:10.1007/s10551-009-0105-1.
- Cohen, A. (1998). *The shaping of American higher education: Emergence and growth of the contemporary system*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Davis, J. A. (1977). *Elementary Survey Analysis*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Eich, D. (2008). A Grounded Theory of High Quality Leadership Programs: Perspectives From Student Leadership Development Programs in Higher Education. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 15(2), 176-187.
- Ghasemy, M., Akbarzadeh, M., & Gaskin, J.E. (2002). Being satisfied and serving communities as outcomes of servant leadership in the academic context: policies based on a multi-level structural equation model. *Asia Pacific Educ. Rev.* 23, 69–86. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12564-021-09702-z>
- Gini, A. (2004). Moral leadership and business ethics. In J. Ciulla (Ed.), *The Heart of leadership* (pp. 25-43). Westport, CT: Praeger Publishers.
- Gregor, M. (1996). Groundwork of the Metaphysics of Morals. In I. Kant, *Practical Philosophy* (p. 429). Cambridge.
- Hair, J. F., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L., & Black, W. C. (2006). *Multivariate data analysis*. New Jersey: Prentice Hall International, Inc.
- House, R. (1976). A 1976 theory of Charismatic leadership. In J. G. Hunt, & L. L. Larson (Eds.), *Leadership: The cutting edge* (pp. 189-207). Carbondale: Southern Illinois University Press.
- Jaschik, S. (2015, August 14). *Phyllis Wise Fires Back at U of Illinois Board*. Retrieved April 11, 2017, from Inside Higher Education: <https://www.insidehighered.com/quicktakes/2015/08/14/phyllis-wise-fires-back-u-illinois-board>.
- Josephson, M. (2001). Making ethical decisions. *Josephson Institute of Ethics*. Retrieved April 17, 2017, from www.josephsoninstitute.org.

- Kolb, D. A. (1981). Learning Styles and Disciplinary Differences. In A. W. Associates, *The Modern American College: Responding to the New Realities of Diverse Students and a Changing Society* (pp. 232-255). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, Inc.
- Kouzes, J., & Posner, B. (1993). *Credibility: How leaders gain and lose it, why people demand it*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.
- Miner, J. B. (1993). *Role Motivation Theories*. New York, NY, USA: Routledge.
- Northouse, P. (2004). *Leadership: Theory and Practice* (3rd ed.). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Northouse, P. G. (2016). *Leadership Theory and Practice* (7th ed.). Chicago, IL: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Robert K. Greenleaf Center for Servant Leadership. (2016). *The Servant as a Leader*. Retrieved August 14, 2017, from Robert K. Greenlead Center for Servant Leadership: <https://www.greenleaf.org/what-is-servant-leadership/>.
- Shareef, R.A., & Atan, T. (2019). The influence of ethical leadership on academic employees' organizational citizenship behavior and turnover intention: Mediating role of intrinsic motivation. *Management Decision*, Vol. 57, No. 3, pp. 583-605. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MD-08-2017-0721>.
- Solomon, R. (2003). The myth of charisma. In J. Ciulla (Ed.), *The ethics of leadership* (pp. 202-212). NBellmount, CA: Wadsworth/Thomson Learning.
- Wong, K. (1998). Culture and moral leadership. *Peabody Journal of Education*, 73(2), 106-125.
- Wolverton, B. (2012, July 12). *Penn State's Culture of Reverence Led to 'Total Disregard' for Children's Safety*. Retrieved 04 11, 2017, from The Chronicle of Higher Education: <http://www.chronicle.com/article/Penn-States-Culture-of/132853>.
- Yukl, G. (2010). *Leadership in Organizations* (7th ed.). Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

About the Authors

Dr. Jonathan Hubchen

Dr. Jonathan Hubchen has over thirty years of program and project management experience in commu-nity and inter-national development. His areas of relevant experience are Program Design and Management, Program Monitoring and Evaluation, Research De-sign and Management and Sustainable Agriculture /Resource Management.Dr. Hubchen speaks Indonesian, Portuguese, Spanish and Visayan/Philippines. His international experience includes work in Timor Leste, Ghana, Honduras, Liberia, Nicaragua, Philippines, five countries in Southern Africa and three countries in the former USSR. In addition to his international work, he is an instructor at LSU's Department of Agricultural & Extension Education and Evaluation where he teaches courses on management in a developing agricultural setting and facilitation skills. Dr. Hubchen can be reached at JHubchen@agcenter.lsu.edu.

Dr. Samuel Wyatt

Dr. Samuel Wyatt has over thirty years of public service, including service in the United States Navy, a career with the Bossier City Police Department, and at several higher education institutions, including Louisiana State University (LSU), Louisiana State University at Shreveport (LSUS), University of South Carolina Aiken (USCA), California Baptist University (CBA), and Louisiana Christian University (LCU). Dr. Samuel Wyatt is employed at Louisiana State University Health Shreveport (LSUHS) as the Chief Compliance and Investigation Officer and Title IX Campus Coordinator. Before serving with LSU Health Shreveport, Dr. Samuel Wyatt served as Director of Investigations in the LSU Office of Internal Audit for the past ten years. Before joining LSU, Dr. Wyatt worked at the Bossier City Police Department and served in the United States Navy. Dr. Samuel Wyatt has served as an Adjunct Professor in on-line Master of Business Administration programs at Louisiana State University at Shreveport (LSUS), University of South Carolina Aiken (USCA), California Baptist University (CBA), and Louisiana Christian University (LCU). Dr. Wyatt also served as an Adjunct Professor in the Criminal Justice Program at Louisiana State University at Shreveport. Dr. Wyatt holds a Doctor of Philosophy (Ph.D.) in Human Resource Education from LSU, a Master of Business Administration (MBA) from Centenary College of Louisiana, a Bachelor of Criminal Justice from Louisiana State University at Shreveport, and an Associate of Criminal Justice from Bossier Parish Community College (BPCC). Dr. Wyatt also holds certifications as a Certified Fraud Examiner (CFE) by the Association of Certified Fraud Examiners (ACFE), a Certified Healthcare Compliance (CHC) by the Health Care Compliance Association (HCCA), a Certified Compliance and Ethics Professional (CCEP) by the Society of Corporate Compliance and Ethics (SCCE), and an EnCase Certified Examiner (EnCE) by OpenText, Inc. Dr. Wyatt can be reached at swyatt@lsuhs.edu.

Dr. Michael F. Burnett

Dr. Michael F. Burnett is a professor at Louisiana State University. He completed his undergraduate and master's degrees at Clemson University. Following this he taught high school agricultural science at Southside High School in Greenville, South Carolina. He completed his PhD degree at The Ohio State University in 1980 and immediately joined the faculty at Louisiana State University. During his 42 years as a member of the faculty at LSU, he has been active in both the undergraduate and graduate teaching programs, the department's research program, and service activities at the university, community, state, and national levels. More recently his activities centered around the graduate programs in which he teaches the research design and methodology courses. Results of his research and that of his students have been published in a wide range of research journals including the *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, the *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal*, the *Journal of Cultural Diversity*, the *International Journal of Training and Development*, the *Journal of Vocational Education Research*, the *Journal of Vocational and Technical Education*, the *Journal of Rural and Small Schools*, the *Journal of Industrial and Technical Teacher Educators*, the *Journal of Agricultural Education*, and the *National Association of Business Teacher Educator Review*. Dr. Burnett also serves as the Head of his department at Louisiana State University. Dr. Burnett can be reached at vocbur@lsu.edu.