Ethics and Educational Leadership: A State of Affairs at the City School Bahawalpur, Pakistan

Muhammad Waheed[a]*, Lubna Shoukat[b]

[a]The Islamia University of Bahawalpur, Pakistan
[b]The Islamia University of Bahawalpur, Pakistan
[a]Email: mwlubna@hotmail.com
[b]Email: mwlubna@yahoo.com

Abstract

This research describes the impact of ethics on educational leadership. A questionnaire was prepared based on various ethical and unethical attributes collected through the interviews and relevant literature. These attributes are people orientation, fairness, power sharing, and concern for sustainability, ethical guidance, role classification, integrity, courageous, conscientiousness, and agreeableness. The unethical behaviours included are 'commands respect,' external locus of control, personalized power, Machiavellianism, vindictive and cynicism. Forty members of teaching staff and managerial staff of two wings of The City School, Bahawalpur Campus were contacted for data collection. They were asked to endorse their responses on the questions keeping in view the leadership behaviours of their Heads and the line managers. The responses were collected, analyzed and presented in the form of data tables. The results suggest that leadership at The City School, Bahawalpur Campus follow ethical trends of leadership. The respondents rated the presence of these attributes of ethical behaviour in their leadership.

Keywords: ethical behaviors; people orientation; fairness; power sharing; and concern for sustainability; ethical guidance; role clarification; integrity; Machiavellianism; personalized power.

----

* Corresponding author

1. Introduction

Ethical problems shatter the faith in leaders and status of organizations. It is the ethics that tries to answer 'what the right is'- the systematic reflection on what is moral. Ethics makes it clear what is right or wrong in a particular situation. As far as the leadership is concerned, ethics evaluates their character, actions, behaviors and ways of dealing. Ethics is momentous to leadership as the leaders have great influence, whatever it is, on their followers [1].

In an organization, ethical leadership is likely to have encouraging effects on the attitudes and conduct of employees and ultimately on organizational performance [2]. Therefore, leaders need to give their followers (employees) a proper respect and treat them with dignity. In this regard, leaders determine the nature of the ethical environment in an organization. Ethical leadership can achieve this by utilizing personal abilities, with appropriate conduct and establishing the interpersonal relationship based upon two-way communication, reinforcement, and decision making. Moreover, five principles- respect for others, service to others, justice for others, honesty toward others, and building community with others- should be followed in developing ethical leadership [3,4].

Ethics and integrity are getting importance and growing amount of attention in the field of leadership due to some moral issues that resulted in underperformance of the employees and bad reputation of the organization, thus, emphasizing the need of ethics in leadership. To understand the phenomenon of ethical leadership, first, we see "what is ethical leadership." According to some researchers [5,6], ethical leadership reflects the normatively approved personal conduct and interpersonal relationships. It means an ethical leadership encompasses two basic aspects-one is individual moral that refers personality characteristics and other as a moral manager which influences others in multiple ways [7].

Different elements of ethical leadership are mentioned in other leadership styles and literature. The transformational and authentic leadership have been described as containing an ethical component. Transformational leadership includes a moral element [8]. Reference [8] pointed out that transformational leaders not only follows the moral principles but also inspire their followers to align themselves with those moral principles.

The transformational leaders could also follow its ethical dimension or act unethically depending upon their motives [9]. Reference [9] also referred the unethical behavior of leaders to pseudo-transformational leadership who have desires that are not lawful and leads to an unjustified goal. There may be many reasons to behave unethically under personalized or socialized power desires of the leader. Another researcher [10] points out that there may be another grounds for the leaders to behave unethically other than the egoism or personalized power. Leaders may also act unethically because of inconsistent altruistic values [8]. In short, transformational leadership can behave unethically if the motivation is selfishness [9]. Power is misused if values do not guide behaviors sufficiently [10].

Authentic leadership also contains a moral component [11]. However, some researchers are not of this view and

they do not endorse decency as a necessary component of authentic leadership, because, for them, authentic leadership behaves in line with the real self [11]. He agrees that a prerequisite to both transformational and authentic leadership is high moral character [12]. Because of the ethical overlap, some researchers contend that there is no difference between transformational leadership and authentic leadership [13].

Researchers also began to think moral leadership as a set of behaviors or a separate leadership style in itself in spite of focusing only on the ethical components of other leadership styles [5]. This approach suggests that an ethical leader follows a system of accepted beliefs rather than self-interest, which can be beneficial for followers, organizations, and society [14]. It is demanding need of a system that can guide leaders what moral values they should adopt when they act as a leader in any institution or organization. A group of researchers [5] address ethical leadership from a social learning perspective and suggest that followers will come to behave similarly to their leader through impression and experiential learning. Similarly, some researchers [15] emphasize that ethical leaders be socially responsible in using the power, and view ethical leadership as the process of influencing in a socially responsible and approved way. If leader is treating the followers in fair and honest way, the followers will respond accordingly. It means leader's moral behavior is the key factor to get the better response of subordinates. To achieve success, every organization, in the context of present research, the school, needs effective leadership to move teachers in the front line effort to achieve excellence in education. Therefore, the school organizations must have an effective leader so that changes can be implemented and higher educational standards at the school level be achieved.

1.1. Objectives of the study

The purpose of this research is to collect the views of employees (teachers) of so to trace diverse dimensions of ethical leadership behavior in the context of an educational organization (The City school Bahawalpur), and also what are not ethical. Also, it will calculate the order of ranks from rating the teachers had given to these ethical and unethical leadership behaviors. The main objectives of this study are:

- To define ethics regarding educational leadership

- To describe the dimensions behavior of ethical leadership

- To highlight the unethical behavior in views of employees (teachers)

- To determine the order of preference given to these ethical and unethical dimensions of behaviors.

2. Theoretical Review

2.1. Dimensions of Ethical Leadership

A review of the ethical leadership literature describes several behavioral aspects of ethical leadership in organizations. Various studies in the field can provide a theoretical basis for identifying these behaviors. A researcher [15] identified three dimensions of ethical leadership- fairness, power sharing, and role clarification.

These (fairness, power sharing, and role clarification) and many other aspects of ethical leadership can be traced in literature. A brief description of these are given below

  a) **Fairness** is seen as the quality of making judgments and dealing others without discrimination and biasness. Ethical leaders act fairly and according to approved principles, are trustworthy and honest, and take responsibility for their own actions [5,15].

  b) **Power sharing** is the characteristic of ethical leaders which enables them to allow their subordinates to participate in the process of decision making and consider their valuable ideas [16]. Sharing power develops a sense of confidence and freedom in subordinates

  c) **Transparency** refers to the open communication and presenting an individual's authentic self to others; and makes clear the performance goals, expectations and responsibilities [5,17]. Ethical leadership follows the principles of transparency.

  d) **The people orientation** attribute in ethical leadership deals with principle of respecting, caring and supporting subordinates, and also make efforts to fulfill their genuine needs [18,19].

  e) **Ethical guidance** implies explanation of ethical rules, conveys standards of ethical conduct and also involves rewards and punishments in order to create responsibility in subordinates [20]. So, the ethical leaders promote the ethical awareness.

  f) **Sustainability** is the next dimension of ethical leadership which focuses on the development of others, distribution of responsibilities and ensuring continuity over time [21].

  g) **Integrity**. Effective ethical leaders honor commitments and expects subordinates the same. They fulfill commitments and apologize when necessary and take responsibility. Reference [22] describes that ethical leaders keep promises and behave consistently.

In addition to the above ethical behaviors, some researchers [20] have identified some other ethical behaviors of ethical leadership like agreeableness (trusting and cooperative), conscientiousness (dutiful and determined), prefer socialized power (use power for the benefit of others), exert internal locus of control (seek connection of his action and outcomes) and attitude of self-monitoring (how they present themselves to others).

2.2. Dimensions of Unethical behaviours

The researchers [20] have also mentioned some unethical behaviors of the leaders. Some of these are Machiavellianism (manipulation of others to accomplish their own goals), personalized power (use of power for self-aggrandizement), external locus of control (do not take responsibility of outcomes), and vindictive (revengeful).

A list of ethical and unethical behaviors of leadership is tabulated in Table-1 below on the basis of above discussion.

3. Methods and Materials

The study was conducted through interviews and a questionnaire based on Likert scale for rating the dimensions of ethical and unethical aspects of leadership behavior. In this study, first interviews (5) were conducted to gain

insight if there could be some new aspects of ethical and unethical behaviors related to leadership. The dimensions of ethical and unethical behaviors mentioned by the respondents were identified and matched with those distinguished through the relevant literature to avoid repeating the similar behaviors. The following table provides this comparison.

Table 1: List of dimensions of ethical and unethical behaviors of leadership indentified through literature

Ethical leadership dimensions	
Fairness	Sustainability
Power sharing	Agreeableness
Role clarification	conscientiousness
People orientation	prefer socialized power
Integrity	internal locus of control
Ethical guidance	self-monitoring
Unethical behaviors of leadership	
Machiavellianism	vindictive
personalized power	external locus of control

On the basis of Table-1 and Table-2, following aspects of ethical behavior were decided to be included in the questionnaire. A brief description of each of them was written so that each respondent could understand the meaning given to them before rating these dimensions. An apparent purpose of the research / data collection was written in the beginning of the questionnaire stating that 'how do you rate the presence of these behaviors in your leadership (management) in your school. Participants were asked to report what they consider as ethical and unethical behaviors at work and to give examples (if any) of their own experiences to explain your selected behavior of their leaders.

3.1. Dimension of Ethical Leadership included in the questionnaire

People Orientation, Fairness, Power Sharing, Concern of Sustainability, Ethical Guidance, Role Clarification, Integrity, courageous, Conscientiousness, Agreeable.

3.2. Dimension of Unethical Leadership included in the questionnaire

The unethical behaviors included in the questionnaire selected from table-1 and table-3 are commands Respect, external locus of control, personalized power, Machiavellianism, vindictive, Cynicism. In the following tabl-3 is given the list of unethical behaviors of leader mentioned by the respondents through interviews.

A 5 point rating scale was given to each question in the part related to ethical behaviors where 1 stands for 'excellent', 2 for 'good', 3 for 'average', 4 for 'weak' and 5 for ' poor'. On the other hand, the rating scale on unethical behaviors also consisted of five points where 1 stands for 'worst', 2 for 'whole lot', 3 for 'even more',

4 for 'little more', and 5 for 'little bit'.

Table 2: Relevancy of ethical behaviors distinguished through interviews with that of traced through relevant literature.

Dimension of Ethical behavior	Description given by the interviewees	Relevancy	Dimension of Ethical behavior	Description given by the interviewees	Relevancy
Respectful	Avoid manipulation & exploitation Recognize dignity & right to informed decision	**Integrity**	Commitment		**Conscienti-ousness**
Cooperativeness		**Agreeable**	Courageous	Do not lose senses when confronted with problem or danger & welcome criticism	
Loyalty	Faithfulness to cause, institution ;Commitment	**conscientiousness**	Self-control	Acting with objectivity by doing what is right	**Fairness**
Confidentiality	That can be trusted to share personal problems	**Integrity**	Recognition	Acknowledge the efforts of others & value them accordingly	**The people orientation**
Responsible	Taking care of rules, fulfill his words	**conscientiousness**	Trustworthiness		**Integrity**
Integrity		**Integrity**	Reliability	Promise keeping Avoid unclear commitment Keep confidentiality	**Integrity**
Openness	Ready to listen views and ideas, accessible	**Power Sharing**	Transparency		**Fairness**

The respondents of the study were the academic employees, i.e., teachers from the entire campus including the senior wing, middle wing and the administration department of The City School, Bahawalpur Campus. The turnout of respondents was 35 out of 40 - 13 respondents from the senior wing, 18 responses from the middle

wing and 4 from administration side. The collected data were analyzed using Henry Garrett Ranking Method to calculate the level of presence of these ethical and unethical behaviors.

The study presented here, has particular strengths. Samples of this study represent a mix of job levels and results that are relatively consistent across the two academic wings of the campus as well as in the admin department of the City School Bahawalpur, Pakistan. The sample size is neither too small nor too large, and it measures the sound properties. A final strength of this investigation is that it included positive as well as negative aspects of behaviors of leadership.

Table 3: Unethical behaviors identified through interviews

Dimension of Unethical behavior	Description given by the interviewees	Relevancy	Dimension of Unethical behavior	Description given by the interviewees	Relevancy
Doubtful			Commands Respect	need to insist on being respected	
Cynicism (distrust)	Belief that people are generally selfish and dishonest		Self-absorption	Pre-occupation with one's own emotions, interest	**Machiavellianism**

4. Results and Discussion

The data collected on various dimensions of ethical and unethical behaviors of leadership of The City school, Bahawalpur was analyzed statistically using the Henry Garret method. The calculations, results and the analysis of results are given below.

The table-4 deals with the dimensions of data on ethical behaviors. The mean scores for each ethical behavior calculated on the basis of Garrett Ranking statistics in this table reflect the value in numerical terms for the dimensions of ethical behavior. The mean score values range from 47 to 56.51. The ethical behavior of 'power sharing' earned the highest mean (56.51) while 'agreeable' remained at lowest mean of 47.0.

According to table-5, the ranks assigned to ethical behaviors on the basis of mean scores calculated by using Garret method are arranged according to higher to lower values of means. The relevant percentages are also given in this table. This ranking order shows that the employees (teachers and managerial) have noticed which of these ethical behaviors reflected by the leadership more frequently than the others. The three most highly observed ethical behaviors are power sharing, ethical guidance and people orientation. The least manifested ethical behaviors are courage, conscientiousness and agreeable in descending ranking order.

Table 4: Mean score of responses on dimensions of ethical behavior calculated through Henry Garret method

S#	Response Preference Order (Ranks)		R1	R2	R3	R4	R5		
	Garret Ranking Conversion Score (x)		**75**	**60**	**50**	**40**	**26**		
	Dimension of Ethical Leadership							**Total Score**	**Mean Score**
1	People Orientation	f	6	10	13	3	3	35	54.23
		fx	450	600	650	120	78	1898	
2	Fairness	f	7	8	12	2	6	35	52.60
		fx	525	480	600	80	156	1841	
3	Power Sharing	f	8	14	6	4	3	35	56.51
		fx	600	840	300	160	78	1978	
4	Concern of Sustainability	f	5	8	12	5	5	35	51.00
		fx	375	480	600	200	130	1785	
5	Ethical Guidance	f	7	10	11	5	2	35	55.06
		fx	525	600	550	200	52	1927	
6	Role Clarification	f	6	13	7	4	5	35	53.43
		fx	450	780	350	160	130	1870	
7	Integrity	f	5	9	8	7	6	35	50.03
		fx	375	540	400	280	156	1751	
8	courageous	f	4	7	10	8	6	35	48.5
		fx	300	420	500	320	156	1696	
9	Conscientiousness	f	5	6	8	9	7	35	47.9
		fx	375	360	400	360	182	1677	
10	Agreeable	f	6	4	8	8	9	35	47.0
		fx	450	240	400	320	234	1644	

Note: x = Garrett Ranking Conversion Score, f = number of respondents, fx = score

The table-6 below presents the mean scores for each unethical behavior calculated by Garrett Ranking method. The mean score values in the table above range from 45 to 57.57. The mean score for 'command respect' is at highest (57.57) rank while 'cynicism' is at the lowest (45.58) position among the six reported unethical behaviors.

The number of respondents to this section of the questionnaire turned out to be less 30 as compare to first part where it was 35. However, the respondents did not also attended questions at serial number 4 and 5 in table-6, and therefore the turn out remained 24 and 25 respectively.

Table 5: Ranking order of responses on ethical behaviors

S #	Dimension of Ethical Leadership	Total Score	Mean Score	Ranks	%age
3	Power sharing	1978	56.51	1	10.95
5	Ethical guidance	1927	55.06	2	10.67
1	People orientation	1898	54.23	3	10.51
6	Role Clarification	1870	53.43	4	10.35
2	Fairness	1841	52.60	5	10.19
4	Concern of sustainability	1785	51.00	6	9.88
7	Integrity	1751	50.03	7	9.69
8	Courageous	1696	48.5	8	9.39
9	Conscientiousness	1677	47.9	9	9.28
10	Agreeable	1644	47.0	10	9.10
	Grand Total	**18067**			

Table 6: Mean score of responses on dimensions of unethical behavior calculated through Henry Garret method

S#	Response Preference Order (Ranks)		R1	R2	R3	R4	R5		
	Garret Ranking Conversion Score (x)		**75**	**60**	**50**	**40**	**26**		
	Dimension of Uethical Leadership							Total Score	Mean Score
1	Machiavellianism	f	5	12	6	3	4	30	53.97
		fx	375	720	300	120	104	1619	
2	personalized power	f	5	9	12	2	2	30	54.90
		fx	375	540	600	80	52	1647	
3	external locus of control	f	6	9	10	4	1	30	55.87
		fx	450	540	500	160	26	1676	
4	vindictive	f	4	5	9	1	5	24	50.83
		fx	300	300	450	40	130	1220	
5	Cynicism	f	2	4	11	3	5	25	45.68
		fx	150	240	450	120	182	1142	
6	Commands Respect	f	7	13	5	3	2	30	57.57
		fx	525	780	250	120	52	1727	

Note: x = Garrett Ranking Conversion Score, f = number of respondents, fx = score

The researcher asked informally respondents the reason of not responding to this part (unethical behavior of

leadership). They argued, "It is religiously prohibited and morally unethical to highlight the negative character of anybody". It is the point that could be explored but this was beyond the scope of this research.

After arranging the mean scores on the unethical dimensions of leadership behavior in descending order in table 7 below, the mostly reported unethical behaviors were 'command respect' and 'external locus of control' respectively. Pakistani society is a high-context and hierarchal. People usually respect others according to certain characteristics like age, sex and status [23]. In this context, the people in command (status) have developed an inner desire to be respected and followed and reflect this desire consciously or unconsciously. So, this 'commands respect' behavior is genuinely reported. The other reported behaviors like 'external locus of control' and 'personalized power' may be attributed as a by-product of 'commands respect'.

Hofstede's cultural dimensions theory presents a framework for the analysis and comparison of cultures As a result the research. Reference [24] empirically established five dimensions of culture. 'Indulgence' is one of those five dimensions. Pakistan, with an extremely low score of 0 on this dimension, can be rated under restrained society. A low score on Indulgence refers to cynicism and pessimism. The reported behavior of 'cynicism' is what is verified by the research findings of Hofstede.

Table 7: Ranking order of responses on unethical behaviors

S #	Dimension of Unethical Leadership	Total Score	Mean Score	Ranks	Percentage
6	Commands Respect	1727	57.57	1	19.12
3	external locus of control	1676	55.87	2	18.56
2	personalized power	1647	54.90	3	18.24
1	Machiavellianism	1619	53.97	4	17.93
4	vindictive	1220	50.83	5	13.51
5	Cynicism	1142	45.68	6	12.65
	Grand Total	**9031**			

5. Conclusion

The relationship between leaders and the followers plays a very significant role in setting the working environment and the level of performance of any institution. In these days, the schools especially the private schools in Pakistan, in general, are being run under the business orientation. Although the concern of business cannot be ignored, the schools should dominantly preoccupy the ethical norms in running their setups. It

depends on upon the behaviors of the leaders. So, this study was conducted to explore the behaviors of leadership in city school of Bahawalpur. The employees (teachers and official staff) reported that school's leadership followed the ethically approved behaviors in administration and management of the school. The employees rated ethical behaviors like power sharing, ethical guidance, people orientation, role clarification, fairness, sustainability, integrity, courageous, conscientiousness, and agreeable. They also reported some unethical behaviors like commands respect, external locus of control, personalized power, Machiavellianism, vindictive and cynicism.

The analysis of data reflects that the leadership of school seems to be inclined to follow ethical behaviors or principles as the management strategy. The data collection was not conducted at the school premises, but the respondents were approached through the post and, in most of the cases, personally at their houses so to minimize the effects of the school environment, i.e., administration. Therefore, the results keep objectivity. It can be concluded the leadership of city school in Bahawalpur prefers ethical behaviors to run the school system.

6. Recommendations

Organizations need leaders to act ethically to achieve the organization's objectives in a socially responsible way and to save and promote their reputation. The schools need this more than any other organization. It may well be advantageous for school organizations to invest in the development of ethical behavior because the products of the schools are not material things but the human personalities.

There should be collaboration among different schools so that their employees can share their experiences and discuss the positive as well as negative dimensions of leadership strategies.

References

[1]. Gary Yukl. Leadership in organizations (8th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson/Prentice Hall, 2012.

[2]. Edward Aronson. "Integrating Leadership Styles and Ethical Perspectives". Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences / Revue Canadienne des Sciences de l'Administration, 18(4), pp. 244–256, 2001.

[3]. Andrew J. DuBrin. Leadership: Research findings, practice, and skills (6th ed.). Mason, OH: South-Western Cengage Learning, 2010.

[4]. Peter Guy Northouse. Leadership: Theory and practice (6th ed.). Thousand Oaks: SAGE, 2013.

[5]. Brown, M. E., Treviño, L. K., & Harrison, D. A. "Ethical leadership: A social learning perspective for construct development and testing". Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 97(2), pp 117–134, 2005.

[6]. Joanne B. Ciulla. Ethics, the heart of leadership (2nd ed.). Westport, Conn.: Praeger, 2004.

[7]. Ilham binti Ismail, & Yaakob bin Daud. (2014). "Influence of Ethical Leadership towards

Organizational Commitment in Schools". International Journal of Scientific and Research Publications, 4(9). Available from http://www.ijsrp.org/research-paper-0914/ijsrp-p3327.pdf [May 5, 2016]

[8]. James MacGregor Burns. Leadership. New York, NY: Harper & Row, 1978.

[9]. Bernard M. Bass. Leadership and performance beyond expectations. New York: Free Press, 1985.

[10]. Terry L Price. "The ethics of authentic transformational leadership". The Leadership Quarterly, 14(1), pp. 67–81, 2003.

[11]. Bruce J. AvolioT, William L. Gardner. "Authentic leadership development: Getting to the root of positive forms of leadership". The Leadership Quarterly, 16(3), 315–338, 2005.

[12]. Howard Gardner. Leading minds: An anatomy of leadership. New York: Basic Books, (2004.

[13]. Bernard M. Bass & Paul Steidlmeier. "Ethics, character, and authentic transformational leadership behavior". The Leadership Quarterly, 10(2), pp.181–217, 1999.

[14]. Rabindra N. Kanungo. "Ethical Values of Transactional and Transformational Leaders". Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences / Revue Canadienne des Sciences de l'Administration, 18(4), pp.257–265, 2001.

[15]. Annebel H.B. De Hoogh & Deanne N. Den Hartog. "Ethical and despotic leadership, relationships with leader's social responsibility, top management team effectiveness and subordinates' optimism: A multi-method study". The Leadership Quarterly, 19(3), pp. 297–311, 2008.

[16]. Deanne N. Den Hartog & Annebel H. B. De Hoogh. "Empowering behaviour and leader fairness and integrity: Studying perceptions of ethical leader behaviour from a levels-of-analysis perspective". European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 18(2), pp.199–230, 2009.

[17]. Fred O. Walumbwa, Bruce J. Avolio, William L. Gardner, Tara S. Wernsing, & Suzanne J. Peterson. "Authentic Leadership: Development and Validation of a Theory-Based Measure". Journal of Management, 34(1), pp. 89–126, 2007.

[18]. Rabindra N. Kanungo & Jay A. Conger. "Promoting Altruism as a Corporate Goal". The Academy of Management Executive, 7(3), pp. 37–48, 1993.

[19]. Linda Klebe Treviño, Michael Brown, & Laura Pincus Hartman. "A Qualitative Investigation of Perceived Executive Ethical Leadership: Perceptions from Inside and Outside the Executive Suite". Human Relations, 56(1), pp. 5–37, 2003.

[20]. Michael E. Brown, & Linda K. Treviño. "Ethical leadership: A review and future directions". The Leadership Quarterly, 17(6), pp. 595–616, 2006.

[21]. Andy Hargreaves & Dean Fink. "The Seven Principles of Sustainable Leadership". Educational Leadership, 61(7), pp. 6–13, 2014.

[22]. Gary A. Yukl. Leadership in organizations (6th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson/Prentice Hall, 2006.

[23]. Shahid Javed Burki. "Pakistan". Internet:

http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/438805/Pakistan/276108/Daily-life-and-social-customs[May 4, 2016]

[24].   Geert H Hofstede. Culture's consequences: Comparing values, behaviors, institutions, and organizations across nations (2nd ed). Thousand Oaks, Calif: Sage Publications, 2001.