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CHAPTER 1

Introduction
1.1 Background

“What the statesman is most anxious to produce is a certain moral character in his fellow citizens, namely a disposition to virtue and the performance of virtuous actions” (Aristotle, n.d.).

Although this quote dates back centuries, it conveys a narrative that is still widely valid and accepted among ethical philosophers of leadership today (Treviño et al., 2000; Treviño et al., 2003; Brown et al., 2005, Kalshoven et al., 2011). This narrative portrays leaders as individuals who are not only focused on developing their own virtues but also actively engaged, through various means, in instilling such virtues in their followers. To elaborate further on the merits of this quote, it is crucial that I first distinguish between values and virtues. Values are goals and aspirations, whereas virtues are the actions that help attain these goals (Krupansky, 2018). Simply put, if sound character is a value, good manners are the actionable virtues that might help achieve this value.

For an average person, it might be possible to deviate from such values without being noticed; their behaviour can be left unexplained, and they can avoid consequences. However, public figures, particularly public leaders, are constantly scrutinized by their immediate followers, stakeholders, the media, and the public on the basis of their statements, decisions, and actions with respect to many types and sources of ethical values. The consequences of a slight deviation from such norms can result in magnified scandals and tarnished reputations not only for public leaders themselves but also for their organization as a whole. It is therefore important that the values expected of leaders be identified early on so that leaders can realize these values through virtues that are socially and culturally informed.

The Aristotle quote harbours a number of ambiguities, the first being a non-exhaustive description of the virtues befitting a statesman. Defining virtues or ethical actions is, however, not an easy task; it is easier to provide examples of non-ethical behaviour. See, for example, the cases of public leaders; for instance, of the tax service scandal (Darroch, 2020) and corruption by civil servants in the fisheries department in The Netherlands by tempering with applications for licensing (TheNews24, 2021). Likewise, business leaders like the CEO and the chairperson of Enron, who were both actively involved in embezzlement within the energy company, nearly brought it to the brink of bankruptcy, and were later convicted (Top 10 Crooked CEOs, n.d.). Similar to such fraudulent activities are
examples of political leaders convicted in harassment charges, such in the case of an Arizona state politician (Associated Press, 2019), which are apparent basic ethical lapses that occur due to lack of adherence to basic ethical values. Such basic lapses can easily be singled out, reported and accused put through justice, but are these the only groups of action deemed ethical lapses in this era?

I argue that over a period of time, more virtues have been added to the behavioural prescriptions for leaders depending on the virtues that are prevalent in that time period. Virtues that are strictly associated with geographical location are henceforth referred to as part of normative values. According to one study, any society must make changes within its value constitution to adapt to changing problems; however, the change must retain coherence to avoid the breakdown of the social order (Vickers, 1968 as cited in Williams, 1979). In summary, whereas the value (ethical leader behaviour) remains the same, the virtues (actions) to attain it might change over time and may result in the identification of sub-values with corresponding attributes. Henceforth, I refer to these gradual or, at times, abrupt changes as evolving values. I further explain the different types of sub-values and their composition through multiple illustrations in the following sections. First, to clarify the ambiguity within the Aristotle quote, no sets of virtues can work (be considered ethical) for all past, present and future references.

I suggest that the identification of necessary changes or additions of sub-values or associating virtues to cope with current problems is equally important for other studies. This is particularly true as a prerequisite for effective and ethical leadership and its scholarship. The complexities of the global era bring forth an abundance of such examples, which call for further classification of leaders’ ethical and unethical activities. Some of these issues are addressed in emerging debates on global ethics (Commers et al., 2008). A hypothetical example in such debates is a leader who avoids an eminent change in her/his organization because his/her self-interest is at stake, and the leader is unprepared to steer the change or fears failure. Other virtues that have only recently been classified as unethical include discrimination in hiring practices and failure to ensure gender equality. The ethics scholarship includes many examples of actions that have only recently been deemed inappropriate. Thus, what it means to be an ethical leader (values) always varies, and at times, there is a need to identify more virtues and sub-values subject to time, place and culture.
The main aim of this dissertation is to identify all constituent components (sub-values and virtues) of the value *ethical behaviour of leaders*. This value, which has changed considerably since the times of philosophers such as Aristotle and Plato, arguably consists of three main sub-value categories: (a) sub-value integrity and all associated individual virtues or universal ideals, (b) normative sub-values pertaining to customs, traditions and culture, and (c) evolving values that have been added to the list over time.

Universal values are similar to the integrity domain (as a value) and refer to basic individual values such as honesty, fairness and the pursuit of joint interests (as opposed to self-interest). This group of sub-values is age-old and includes basic universal ethical principles that apply throughout time. However, many values are closely related to the customs, traditions, and norms (cultural, religious or otherwise) in a particular region, for example, practices pertaining to greetings, gestures and communication. These are referred to as normative sub-values. In addition to basic principles and normative sub-values, the third set of behavioural expectations that evolve over time includes virtues such as guaranteeing women’s rights, freedom of speech and inclusion, including access to rights and extension of services to minority groups. Figure 1 depicts the composition of ethical behaviour of leaders with sub-values spread over three categories in a value pyramid of ethical leadership. The discussion of ethical leadership theories that
dominate the literature revolves around the presence or absence of these values (Den Hartog, 2015). An elaboration of normative sub-values is not an integral part of the discussion, but I keep this distinction to support the final analysis of our results.

1.2 Research questions in this thesis

The aim of this dissertation is to further develop the construct of ethical leadership. Leaders, as models, are evaluated on all three types of sub-values; they are expected to personify behaviour that is ethically exemplary. However, scrutinizers lack an exhaustive list of the exemplary ethical behaviour they wish to witness in such role models – and for that matter, leaders might also lack such a list. It is therefore important to engage in academic debate over the public behavioural mandate, to aid the assessment of leaders’ behaviour and, more importantly, to help equip individuals with skills to help them develop into more effective leaders. This puzzle regarding an ethical and ideal behavioural roadmap has long remained part of academic and philosophical discourse, dating back to writings from early philosophers (Hackett and Wang, 2012). More recently, the literature pertaining to ethical leadership has received great attention from scholars, as media and institutional watchdogs keep a close eye on and highlight moral lapses of leaders across multiple sectors and borders. Scandals continue to arise as regulations fail to control offenses by leaders (Bragues, 2008, as cited in Hackett and Wang, 2012). Hence, it is crucial to take stock of existing ethical leadership studies and classify and update attributes that researchers associate with leaders according to the three-tier classification I discussed above. Doing so will appraise readers of the latest developments in this field pertaining to ethical leadership conceptualization in terms of the sub-values and virtues that have always been present and those that have been added over time. It is also interesting to see whether such changes have had an impact on the definition of ethical leadership (required changes or made it obsolete) and how it affects the use of measurement tools validated by numerous empirical studies. I further elaborate on the three-tier model in the upcoming sections. Table 1 presents an overview of our questions and sub-questions addressed in each chapter.
Table 1. Overview of research questions in this dissertation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Research question</th>
<th>Sub-questions</th>
<th>Dissertation chapters addressing these sub-questions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How can ethical leadership be defined, conceptualized and measured?</td>
<td>1. How can ethical leadership be defined?</td>
<td>Chapter 3 and Chapter 4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. How can ethical leadership be conceptualized?</td>
<td>Chapter 2 and Chapter 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. How can ethical leadership be measured?</td>
<td>Chapter 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1.3 Ethical leadership literature

1.3.1 The seminal construct

Interest in the ethical behaviour of leaders did not start recently; it dates back to the work of early philosophers. However, as a domain and a term within academia, the discussion on ethical leadership started about two decades ago with the seminal studies of Treviño and colleagues (Treviño et al., 2000; Treviño et al., 2003). In their study, Treviño and colleagues (2000; 2003) categorize ethical leadership as containing two sub-values: the moral person and the moral manager. A moral person is characterized by a list of individual attributes pertaining to the integrity of a leader himself/herself, whereas a moral manager is characterized by a set of virtues associated with a leader promoting ethical behaviour in his/her followers through various means.

Subsequent studies by a related group of authors have defined and shaped the initial construct of ethical leadership (Brown et al., 2005). Brown and colleagues (2005) define ethical leadership as “the demonstration of normatively appropriate conduct through personal action and interpersonal relationships, and the promotion of such conduct to followers through two-way communication, reinforcement, and decision-making” (Brown et al., 2005, p.120). This definition lists a clear and empirically validated set of activities prescribed for ethical leaders and has laid the foundation for many academic empirical inquiries into ethical leadership, its effects and its antecedents.

The aspect distinguishing Brown et al.’s (2005) conceptualization from that in previous work is that in addition to a set of sub-values (moral person and moral manager), it includes a set of virtues that serve as guidelines for leaders.
However, based on the discussion pertaining to Figure 1, the conceptualization by Brown and colleagues (2005) lacks an explanation of the normative nature of leadership (the middle classification of Figure 1). It also remains to be seen whether there is room for more sub-values and virtues with regard to the current ethics and leadership debate (the upper classification of Figure 1). Figure 2 shows a value pyramid similar to that in Figure 1. However, the green portion represents the values that are covered by the conceptualization by Brown and colleagues (2005). As illustrated in the figure, this conceptualization comprises only one layer of the value pyramid. This dissertation aims to propose a broader concept that covers all three layers of the pyramid and includes more than the basic values included in the construct by Brown and colleagues (2005). In the subsequent chapters of this dissertation, I will discuss the behaviours that are addressed in different ethical leadership constructs and elaborate on their strengths and weaknesses. The findings of this dissertation will help identify an ethical leadership construct that encompasses the existing insights from academic literature to include all related sub-values and virtues.

Presently, ethical values are not only part of ethical leadership literature but associating leadership styles as well (elaborated in upcoming section). It can be argued that as a distinct conceptualization, the seminal construct of ethical leadership (Treviño et al., 2000; Brown et al., 2005) focuses on the ethical features that are not part of other leadership theories and thus can identify unique set of antecedents and effects for ethical leadership. However, by focusing on unique ethical attributes (only found in the seminal construct), the ethical leadership scholarship misses the basic fundamental ethical attributes of associated leadership styles which can be equally important for leaders to be considered ethical.

In the present times, some of these values, for instance pertaining to diversity, leader’s learning and human rights, can be considered more important (in some cases) than others for public as well as non-public leaders. Therefore, a conceptualization focusing only on seminal construct runs the risk of being incomplete and disregarding changing societal expectations from all public, business and political leaders. It is for this reason that the seminal construct and the associating measurement scales based on such constructs needs to be brought at par with contemporary literature and is considered insufficient at present because ethical components of other leadership styles are not taken into
account sufficiently.

Figure 2. Value pyramid according to Brown et al.’s (2005) conceptualization

1.3.2 Relation to existing leadership styles

Central to the discussion of ethical leadership is the way this type of leadership relates to other constructs in the leadership literature. Herein, I discuss whether ethical leadership is different from other leadership styles or, on the contrary, all leadership styles have ethical components. On the one hand, the definition of ethical leadership cited above includes activities such as ‘reinforcement’, which equates to the idea of the use of rewards and punishments, which is typical of transactional leadership (Burns, 1978 as cited in MacKenzie, Podsakoff and Rich, 2001). On the other hand, the definition also includes the display of ‘personal actions’, which can imply role-model behaviour that is typical of authentic leaders (Avolio and Gardner, 2005), who align their actions with their principles. The inclusion of such activities in ethical leadership reveals overlapping virtues within these leadership styles, but the immediate connection between them is not clear. Establishing such mutual linkages across multiple leadership styles and examining the interplay between these roles constitute the second aim of this dissertation.

For better clarity, while elaborating on the importance and dissecting ethical leadership as a concept, I also discuss the close association of ethical leadership (the seminal two-dimensional construct) with related leadership styles. To this
end, I provide a clear and concise definition of associated leadership styles and list the ethical and leadership terms that are extensively used in this dissertation. These explanations depict the understanding of these terms upheld in this study. The numerous leadership styles, from virtuous to transactional leadership, are behaviours that share sub-values and virtues with the concept of ethical leadership. As mentioned previously, I dissect ethical leadership as a desired behavioural value into three sub-values, as illustrated in the value pyramid shown in Figure 1. They represent clusters of actionable virtues that help achieve this value. The virtues within these clusters are at times completely or partially similar to the virtues that are representative of numerous leadership styles. Establishing linkages of these leadership styles across the value pyramid will not only help in distinguishing similarities and differences among these leadership styles but also help in exploring the role of these styles within the ethical leadership domain. I am aware that these numerous associating leadership styles have been, at times, represented differently through varying multiple constructs. For example, there are numerous constructs of any single individual leadership style, such as virtuous leadership, with common fundamental values across these multiple constructs but slightly varied sub-values. To address this complexity, this dissertation will take into account a common narrative for discussions on similarities and differences to establish neutral grounds.

I briefly explain virtuous, authentic, positive, spiritual and transformational leadership styles due to their close proximity to the concept of ethical leadership based on identical virtues and seminal literature. I discuss virtuous and positive leadership styles because the virtues associating these leadership styles closely resemble the seminal construct of ethical leadership (Brown and Treviño, 2006; Brown et al, 2005; Wang and Hackett, 2016; Van Wart, 2014. Furthermore, the literature has already established connections between ethical leadership and authentic, transactional, spiritual and transformational leadership (Brown and Treviño, 2006). Based on the virtues shared between these styles and the seminal ethical leadership construct, the overlap seems absolute for some types of leadership (virtuous, transactional and positive leadership styles). However, for others, the overlap seems partial at best (authentic, spiritual and transformational leadership). This implies that the association between ethical leadership and these associated leadership styles is a puzzle that remains to be solved.
An important similarity among these relationships pertains to virtuous leadership, which refers to sub-values that relate to the personal integrity of leaders and are part of the moral person (sub-value) component of the ethical leadership conceptualization discussed earlier (Treviño et al., 2000; Treviño et al., 2003; Brown et al., 2005). Both virtuous leadership and the moral person dimension of ethical leadership (first layer of the pyramid) represent sub-values such as honesty, fairness, and prudence (Wang and Hackett, 2016; Treviño et al., 2000; Treviño et al., 2003; Brown et al., 2005).

Transactional leadership is equivalent to reinforcement, a component of the moral manager (sub-value) in Brown and colleagues’ conceptualization (2005). It involves the exchange of rewards and punishments to infuse desired behaviour in followers. The sub-values associated with reinforcement and transactional leadership are fairness and objectivity. On account of these sub-values, transactional leadership and ethical leadership (assuming reinforcement as part of the ethical leadership conceptualization) are both known to display fairness. The literature on the seminal construct of ethical leadership (Brown and Treviño, 2006, p. 598) emphasizes that ethical leadership is transactional in nature.

Similarly, authentic leaders are considered trustworthy role models for followers by “walking the talk”. A study by Brown and Treviño (2006) establishes a link between ethical leadership and affective trust in leaders. According to the ethical leadership study by Brown and Treviño (2006, p. 598), ethical leadership is similar to authentic leadership in terms of role modelling, integrity, ethical decision making and concern for others. The two differ, however, because ethical leaders emphasize more transactional styles and are focused on awareness of others, whereas authentic leaders are focused on self-awareness. In making this comparison, Brown and colleagues draw on authentic leadership studies by Avolio, Luthans and Walumbwa (2004) and Luthans and Avolio (2003). However, it is not immediately clear whether “awareness of others” refers to employees alone or extends beyond employees to external stakeholders of organizations. Some authentic leadership virtues relating to optimism and resilience are also the defining characteristics of positive leadership as well as ethical leadership (Brown and Treviño, 2006; Van Wart, 2014).
Transformational leadership is associated with steering change in organizations. Of the styles that seem partially related to ethical leadership, transformational leadership is considered the closest. Transformational leaders can be ethical or unethical leaders (Bass, 1985, as cited in Brown and Treviño, 2006) and thus are further divided into authentic transformational leaders and pseudo-transformational leaders (Bass and Steidlmeier, 1999, as cited in Brown and Treviño, 2006). The latter are known for engineering change in pursuit of their own personal benefit. Table 1 provides a brief overview of associated terms and leadership styles. This dissertation aims to solve the puzzle of the relationship between ethical leadership and associated leadership styles.

Table 1. A typology of ethical leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terms/classification</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethical leadership (seminal construct)</td>
<td>The demonstration of normatively appropriate conduct through personal action and interpersonal relationships, and the promotion of such conduct to followers through two-way communication, reinforcement, and decision-making” (Brown et al., 2005, p.120)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical leadership (broader ethical leadership construct proposed in this dissertation)</td>
<td>Ethical leadership is the implicit and explicit pursuit of desired ethical behavior for self and followers through efforts governed by rules and principles that advocate learning motivation, healthy optimism and clarity of purpose to uphold the values of empowerment, service to others, concern for human rights, change for betterment and fulfilling duty towards society, future generations, environment and its sustainability” (Shakeel et al., 2020)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Normative</td>
<td>Relating to the norms and customs of a region</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Integrity</td>
<td>A characteristic or quality that refers to accordance with relevant moral values and norms (p.4, Huberts, 2014).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtues</td>
<td>The idea of good in humans, as perceived by philosophers such as Socrates, Plato and Aristotle (Shelp, 1985; Von Wright, 1963, as cited in Warna et al., 2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construct/conceptualization</td>
<td>Composition of the variable under discussion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtuous leadership (all leadership styles as operationalized by Van Wart, 2014)</td>
<td>A leadership style focusing on the good and desired virtues in leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transactional leadership</td>
<td>A leadership style focusing on the leader using rewards and punishments as means of encouraging and discouraging followers</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Terms/classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Terms/classification</th>
<th>Explanation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Authentic leadership</td>
<td>A leadership style focusing on the conduct of leaders in contrast to their teachings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive leadership</td>
<td>A leadership style focusing on the optimistic nature of leaders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual leadership</td>
<td>A leadership style focusing on the concern of leaders for followers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational leadership</td>
<td>A leadership style focusing on sharing a mutual vision and governing/implementing change within an organization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### 1.3.3 Measuring ethical leadership

For ethical leadership to grow as a domain within the wider leadership literature, it is crucial that the literature supply a sound and tested measurement scale that can be used to build further literature and cross-analyse empirical ethical leadership studies. Seminal studies provide an empirically tested questionnaire called the ethical leadership scale (ELS) (Brown et al., 2005). However, other scales have also been developed, such as the Ethical Leadership Questionnaire (ELQ) (Yukl et al., 2013) and Ethical Leadership at Work (ELW) (Kalshoven et al., 2011). Currently, the measurement of ethical leadership faces two main problems: (a) the existence of multiple scales, which hinders replication of ethical leadership research and theory development, and (b) the narrow construct of ethical leadership in current scales. Because of these limitations, these scales cover only part of the value pyramid depicted in Figures 1 and 2. No existing scale is based on a broader concept and covers multiple layers of the value pyramid. Developing a broader measurement tool can support the cross-analysis of existing studies. I will develop and test a common broader scale, fulfilling the third and fourth aims of this dissertation, respectively.
1.4 Relevance

1.4.1 Literature

Existing ethical leadership research includes various empirical and non-empirical work across multiple sectors and geographical boundaries. This dissertation aims to advance the field by developing a better understanding of the term ‘ethical leadership’. To achieve this contribution, this dissertation includes a structured literature review to critically discuss the shortcomings of the current literature. The structured literature review will (a) support the cross-analysis of existing studies to identify common patterns and (b) address the concerns and shortcomings of existing studies. This study will thus help identify emerging themes (common patterns) and lead the discussion on the comparison of important theories to date. The study’s contribution to the literature will be a new and better framed conceptualization of ethical leadership that addresses existing limitations. The empirical validation outlines the two conceptual papers that offer not only a synthesis of existing constructs but also an alternate way to understand leadership through a processual viewpoint.

This dissertation also makes a number of contributions to the academic debate. Through a structured literature review, it identifies themes that are currently popular in the literature. This study raises critical questions on the progress within these themes and answers them by proving a definition/conceptualization that addresses gaps in existing constructs. Through this conceptualization, the ethical leadership literature has now established a linkage with associated leadership styles; moreover, evolving issues pertaining to sustainability, diversity, human rights and leader learning are emphasized. This study paves the way for future researchers to revalidate existing studies with a different overarching tool.

1.4.2 Measurement tool

One of the primary contributions of this dissertation is the development of a new ethical leadership measurement tool that addresses the limitations of existing scales and takes into account newly identified sub-values of ethical leadership. The Broader Ethical Leadership Scale (BELS) can be adapted across multiple sectors and industry needs. The BELS was tested based on public officials based in the Netherlands. Exploratory factor analysis and AMOS modelling using SPSS were used to conduct exploratory factor analysis and check for model fitness using quantitative studies, as a first step towards validation.
1.4.3 **Societal**

Considering the growing number of scandals erupting in managerial circles across multiple sectors, this dissertation provides an authentic tool for practitioners to use evaluate the desired ethical values of existing leaders and instil the desired ethical values in incumbent leaders. The definition of broader ethical leadership provides a framework that is adaptable to political, business and public leaders. Management consultants can benefit from incorporating BELS in training programmes. Consultants advising leaders regarding a variety of problems (including personal and organizational) can benefit from using this conceptualization as a framework for effective leadership and dealing with moral conundrums. An interesting aspect is the link to sustainability and adherence to human rights. The BELS can be used by practitioners working to make corporations greener and more responsible. An emphasis is placed on addressing the issues pertaining to the public sector, where such trainings can be of great importance. The BELS can also provide a useful self-assessment exercise for leaders seeking self-development, support HR managers who are actively involved in shaping the code of conduct for public and private offices, and aid in the assessment of leaders by ethical committees.

1.5 **Outline of dissertation**

This dissertation consists of six chapters reporting on four studies. Chapter 2 presents the findings from a structured literature review on ethical leadership. This review is followed by two conceptual chapters. Chapter 3, the first conceptual chapter, explores the possibility of studying ethical leadership more generally as a process and proposes multiple steps of processual stages. Next, Chapter 4 discusses the development of a broader conceptualization, presents the critique of earlier research and synthesizes existing ethical leadership constructs to develop a new, broader understanding of ethical leadership. Chapter 5 empirically tests the new scale on a sample of Dutch civil servants. In Chapter 6, the conclusion, I present and discuss the answers to the research questions posed earlier. I also highlight the various limitations of this dissertation and provide an agenda for future research. Table 3 lists the subsequent chapters of this dissertation, the methods used in them and their publication status.
To identify emerging themes within the existing literature, a structured literature review was conducted following a standard protocol (see Chapter 2). Two search engines were used to generate results, from which four emerging themes were identified: conceptualizations of ethical leadership, articles focusing on measurement scale, articles focusing on the public sector, and articles focusing on negative consequences, which we believed was a theme not explored by existing reviews. The review helped establish which conceptualization of ethical leadership is most popular and which scale of ethical leadership is used most often. Interestingly, a growing number of articles discuss the negative tendencies of an overemphasis on ethical leadership, which opens Pandora’s box of using strategies to address ethical leadership concerns in public and private organizations. These findings are the basis for a new conceptualization of ethical leadership in Chapters 3 and 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Chapter</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Publication Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 1: Introduction</td>
<td>N.a.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 2 Ethical Leadership: A structured review into construct, measurement, public sector context and effects</td>
<td>Structured literature review</td>
<td>Published in International Journal of Public Leadership (2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 3 Ethical Leadership as Process: A Conceptual Proposition</td>
<td>Structured literature review</td>
<td>Published in Public Integrity (2019)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 4 A broader conceptualization and measurement scale of ethical leadership</td>
<td>Structured literature review</td>
<td>Published in Journal of Values based Leadership (2020)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 5 Validation of a broader conceptualization and measurement scale</td>
<td>Survey N=909 civil servants in the Netherlands</td>
<td>Submitted to international peer-reviewed journal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chapter 6: Conclusions</td>
<td>N.a.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The question about ethical leadership conceptualization is similar to the question about the relationship between ethical leadership and associated leadership styles. Seminal studies of the field have established close linkages of ethical leadership with transactional, authentic and transformational leadership styles. Chapter 3 uses the findings from the structured literature review to propose a processual view of ethical leadership. This view regards ethical leadership as an amalgam of ethical values of numerous leadership styles, and it identifies steps, based on an external orientation, that leaders can take to shift from one end of the ethical leadership timeline to another. Subject to empirical validation, studying ethical leadership as a process will determine its close association with numerous leadership styles and help determine whether the ethical behaviour of leaders is separate from the virtues related to these leadership styles. A processual view will also aid in understanding the acquisition of ethical virtues as a consequence of predetermined sequences that can be followed to achieve the necessary behaviour at a given level.

The findings from the structured literature review and the synthesis of existing conceptualizations highlight and identify gaps in the literature within the existing constructs. These gaps are addressed in Chapter 4 by presenting a broader conceptualization of ethical leadership. A new definition of ethical leadership is supplied that addresses the critique of the existing definition. To develop a measurement tool that resembles the broader conceptualization, numerous existing questionnaires and self-developed items were used to develop the BELS. The BELS is an amalgam of existing scales and that measure virtuous leadership, transformational leadership, positive leadership, servant leadership and CSR. The items from these scales and some self-developed items were used to align with the categorization proposed by Van Wart (2014). This alignment helped to maintain consistency and avoid repetition in representing virtues that were part of these leadership styles.

The BELS questionnaire proposed in Chapter 4 was tested empirically by using data from 909 civil servants in the Netherlands. The findings are reported in Chapter 5. We used model fit techniques in AMOS and exploratory factor analysis in SPSS for the analysis. At first, the classification used in the BELS did not yield a good fit, but in additional analyses, the BELS items were revealed to have a better fit in a one-factor model of ethical leadership. This one-factor model showed that
conventional and contemporary values are part of a broader ethical leadership scale. It also showed that ethical leadership is indeed not separate from other styles but, as Chapter 3 suggests, part of a broader process. The final tested model of BELS yielded 35 items. Further replication of the BELS is necessary for validation, in different settings, samples and cultures, to determine its fitness across multiple sectors, including political and non-political spheres.

The insights from this dissertation yield a broader ethical leadership conceptualization. The broader construct incorporates sub-values and associated virtues of ethical leadership that were both relevant in terms of basic ethical values and aligned with the present moral debate. In doing so, this dissertation also provides a definition that represents existing and newly identified sub-values (see top-most tier in Figure 1). Mapping these sub-values with associating virtues will help establish linkages of ethical leadership with associated leadership styles and define boundaries between these concepts. Chapter 6 of this dissertation presents conclusions and reflections, listing a number of limitations of the studies and providing a clear agenda for future research.
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CHAPTER 2

Ethical leadership
A structured review into construct, measurement, public sector context and effects
2.1 Introduction

Ethics was already a topic of discussion by philosophers like Plato, Aristotle and Kant. They continue to influence the debate within moral philosophy (Heinaman, 2003). As a domain of academic empirical research, ethical leadership has, however, emerged about a decade ago, probably owing to the increased media attention for unethical behavior in various organizations and public offices. Examples include corruption in the South African national public service (Pillay, 2004) as well as sexual assault and harassment in the US military (Alexander and Stewart, 2013; Dinan, 2013; Horwitz, 2013; Shane, 2013a, b as quoted in Hassan et al., 2014).

The initial pace of research was slow, but now it seems to be gaining momentum, which is mainly due to the efforts of pioneering researchers such as Brown et al. (2005, p. 120), who formulated a definition that most researchers have followed (Mayer et al., 2009; Heres and Lasthuizen, 2012; Hassan, 2015; Pucic, 2015; Thaler and Helmig, 2016; Wright et al., 2016).

Due to the rapid expansion of the field in the last few years, it is now time to assess the volume of material in order to analyze and organize it, and provide an overview of the most important findings. This paper aims to provide such a structured overview by giving a summarized review of studies. It primarily attempts to seek answers regarding the conceptualization of ethical leadership theories following the popular definition of Brown et al. (2005) and the categorization of different types ethical leadership by Van Wart (2014), the existence of popular measurement instruments for ethical leadership, specific findings on ethical leadership in the public sector and outcomes of ethical leadership in terms of benefits and negative consequences.

Even though ethical leadership as a research area does not focus upon one type of organization, we will give special attention to ethical leadership in the public sector because ethics seems to have significance for public organizations including the local governments as they have responsibility of disbursing public funds (Downe et al., 2016), there can be dire consequences in terms of lack of trust among citizens in public institution in the face of ethical lapses (Vigoda-Gadot, 2007; Villoria et al., 2013, as quoted in Hassan et al., 2014) and so far the literature on leadership has not paid much attention to the public sector context (Van der Voet, 2016).
We first present the method section, followed by a discussion of the four themes: definition, measurement, public sector context and negative consequences. Each section is built up in the same way; we present the findings, discuss them and offer recommendations for future research. In the final section, we summarize the results and discuss the limitations of our study.

2.2 Method
Literature reviews that follow a rigid process are considered more objective. Massaro et al. (2016) classify literature reviews on a continuum with two extremes. On the one extreme of the continuum are the type of reviews which follow no or little structure and include methods such as rapid reviews and traditional literature reviews. The other side of the continuum includes methods with rigorous procedures and rules such as systematic and structured reviews. Our paper aims to follow the rigorous procedure and therefore starts from a literature protocol, with the aim to add rigor, reduce subjective bias and advance on the status quo in the field of ethical leadership. Figure 1 represents the scheme for selection of studies.

This review was conducted using two databases: Web of Science and Google Scholar. The search term used in both databases to generate results was “ethical leadership.” The search term yielded 1456 results in Web of Science and 996 results in Google Scholar. For this review we only considered research studies published between the year 2000 and June, 2017.

Next, inclusion criteria were applied with regard to the title and abstract, and fit with one of our four themes: constructs of ethical leadership, measurement scales relating ethical leadership studies, public sector ethical leadership studies and negative consequences of ethical leadership studies.

Studies relating to constructs of ethical leadership
Nine articles were found related about “Constructs of Ethical Leadership” in the results generated from the Web of Science search, whereas 20 studies were found in Google Scholar. After eliminating articles that were found in both search engines, a total of 19 articles were found.
Studies relating to measurement scales of ethical leadership

For this category, we found 19 studies from Web of Science and Google Scholar. Four studies were adaptations of original scales of ethical leadership into different languages and two studies were different versions of the same instrument by the same authors. For our analysis only original articles were selected, leaving out adaptations, leading to a total of four studies to be included in the review.

Public sector studies of ethical leadership

The scrutiny of articles yielded 26 results from Web of Science, and 31 results from Google Scholar. In the next step, we removed studies which were not strictly related to ethical leadership for example articles relating more to ethical culture, ethical codes and public-private partnerships. The remaining 19 articles are analyzed in this review.

Studies relating to negative consequences of ethical leadership

This review also considers six studies that investigate the negative consequences of ethical leadership. Although the list of articles for this classification is small, the selected studies reflect an upcoming research avenue.

Descriptive result. Appendix presents an overview of 45 articles (online available). The review includes nine articles from Journal of business ethics, four from Leadership Quarterly, three from Leadership and two each from Public Administration Review, Journal of leadership and organizational studies, and Organization behaviour and human decision processes and 25 other journals had one publication. The diversity of journals shows that ethical leadership is studied from a range of disciplines and perspectives.
Figure 1. Protocol of structured review

For each of the themes we will discuss:

1. What are the current insights on ethical leadership?
2. What is the critique on the literature on this theme of ethical leadership?
3. What should future studies address regarding this theme?
Chapter 2

2.3 Ethical leadership: definitions and categorizations

*Insights*

The earliest studies define ethical leadership in numerous ways. For example, Moreno (2010) (as quoted in Monahan, 2012, p. 61) states that an “Ethical leader is the one who has no gap between actions and words.” However, the definition by Brown *et al.* has become the most popular: “the demonstration of normatively appropriate conduct through personal action and interpersonal relationships, and the promotion of such conduct to followers through two-way communication, reinforcement, and decision-making” (Brown *et al.*, 2005, p. 120). For example, out of the total 45 studies that are part of this review, 21 use only Brown *et al.* (2005) definition, 12 discuss multiple definitions including Brown’s construct whereas 15 studies use no definition at all.

In the definition by Brown *et al.* (2005), there are two main components of ethical leadership: the “moral person” and the “moral manager” (Trevino *et al.*, 2000). The component “moral person” takes into account the leaders' own personal character, values and ethical nature (Aronson, 2001, p. 253). The second component, “moral manager,” refers to all the efforts and activities that a leader undertakes to promote ethical decision making and behavior among his followers (Brown *et al.*, 2005, p. 117). These activities have been explained (as quoted in Heres and Lasthuizen, 2012) to include role modeling (Trevino *et al.*, 2000, p. 134), reinforcement (Brown *et al.*, 2005; Mayer *et al.*, 2009) and communication about ethics (Grojean *et al.*, 2004; De Hoogh and Den Hartog, 2008; Van den Akker *et al.*, 2009; Piccolo *et al.*, 2010). Some researchers also view empowerment as one of the sub-processes of the moral manager (Heres and Lasthuizen, 2012; Resick *et al.*, 2006; Den Hartog and De Hoogh, 2009).

Several authors draw similarities between ethical leadership and other leadership styles. For example, Treviño *et al.* (2003) found that ethical leaders use both transactional type influence processes as well as transformational leadership to influence followers. According to Burns (1978), a transformational leader is someone who obtains support by inspiring followers to identify with a vision that reaches beyond their own self-interests, whereas transactional leaders obtain cooperation by establishing exchanges with followers and then monitoring the exchange relationship. Transactional leadership is similar to the reinforcement activity within the moral manager component of ethical leadership.
Bass (1985) described four dimensions of transformational leadership, one of which is idealized influence, which is defined as having an ethical component. It means that leaders are role models for their followers to emulate (Avolio, 1999, p. 43). However, some studies have suggested that transformational and charismatic leaders can also be unethical (Bass, 1985) if they are motivated by selfishness rather than altruism (Bass, 1998; Howell, 1988; Howell and Avolio, 1992), and if they use power inappropriately (House and Aditya, 1997; McClelland, 1975). We will return to the topic of negative consequences of ethical leadership later on.

Other studies link the moral manager to situational characteristics. For example, in a study conducted by Heres and Lasthuizen (2012), who used the term of “veriform universal phenomenon” for ethical leadership, they studied managers’ conceptualization of ethical leadership across different types of organization. The focus of individual components of the moral manager dimension was found to vary depending on the type of organization. For example, the communication component was more explicit in public organizations, while private organizations were found to communicate ethics in their organizations more implicitly.

Another study by Wright and Quick (2011) focuses on the importance of the role of character for ethical leadership. This study explains and links the possibility of assigning particular signature character strengths to specific career jobs, and the possibility of training leaders to those specific character strengths.

Central to the topic of ethical leadership is also the construct by Kalshoven et al. (2011) which is the basis of the measuring scale ELW (see more below). They identify seven ethical leader behaviors (fairness, integrity, ethical guidance, people orientation, power sharing, role clarification and concern for sustainability).

Another author who compares various ethical leadership styles is Van Wart (2014). This study proposes different categories of ethical leadership based on three approaches: the classic virtue approach, the deontological approach and the teleological approach. The classic virtue school of thought promotes ethical leadership in terms of the moral values of the leader him/herself and the capacity of the leader to strive for better in terms of his own moral behavior as well as development through self-evaluation. The deontological approach, on the other hand, promotes ethical leadership by highlighting the aspects of leadership that abide by rules and principles and can be based on aspirations, whereas the
teleological approach focuses on the end product of ethical conduct which can be activities like the corporate social responsibility and may include leadership styles such as transforming leadership. Brown et al. have been classified by Van Wart (2014) as proponents of the deontological approach where the focus of the theorists is more on the rules and the principles of the organization. According to Van Wart (2014), these different theories complement rather than contradict each other. However, scholars will use varying definitions depending on the theory they uphold. Ethical leadership is upheld as a separate construct and leadership style by theorists like Brown et al. (2005), whereas contemporary theorists like Van Wart (2014) see it as ethical aspects of different leadership styles, which could be interpreted as ethics of leadership. This is also in line with viewing ethical leadership as process entailing multiple leadership styles (Shakeel et al., 2019).

**Critique**

There are multiple constructs of ethical leadership in the literature which do not overlap each other completely. The construct and definition by Brown et al. (2005) upholds a two-dimensional construct of ethical leadership. On the other hand, Kalshoven et al. (2011) use a construct that includes seven key attributes including but not limited to concern for sustainability and role clarification, which are not a part of Brown’s et al. (2005) conceptualization. Van Wart’s categories of ethical leadership illustrate an even broader construct. Hence a common construct of ethical leadership is missing.

**Focus for upcoming research**

The definition of Brown et al. (2005) is the most frequently used in the literature but highlights only one aspect of ethical leadership. Although Brown and Treviño (2006) (as quoted in Den Hartog, 2015) differentiate ethical leadership from other leadership styles like authentic, spiritual and transformational leadership, a broader viewpoint may be that all these styles are in fact different levels of the same matrix that is ethical leadership (see e.g. Van Wart, 2014). The idea of a broader definition or construct has not been proposed or tested yet, but opens up interesting avenues for future research (see discussion).
2.4 Measurement of ethical leadership

*Insights*

Out of the total 45 studies that are part of this review, 28 use surveys, 9 use interviews, and 8 use a mix of literature reviews, conceptual studies, secondary data analysis and case studies. The 28 studies that used ethical leadership questionnaires (ELQ) made use of the Ethical leadership scale (ELS) developed by Brown *et al.* (2005) in ten studies, the ELQ developed by Yukl *et al.* (2013) in four studies, data used from the Globe survey in three studies and numerous other surveys in nine studies. This shows that there is not one single popular scale for ethical leadership used both in public sector studies and in the ethical leadership literature in general.

Yukl *et al.* (2013) give a critical review of many measurements previously used, mainly on the grounds of construct validity. For example, in their review of the ethical leadership work (ELW) questionnaire (2011), they conclude that the items related to power sharing are more related to relationship behavior than to ethical leadership. However, in a study by Heres and Lasthuizen (2012) the same behavior, empowerment, was considered to be a significant part of ethical leadership by 17 out of 18 managers in a field interview spread across different organizations of various sizes in multiple industries. In answer to the concerns raised in their review, Yukl *et al.* (2013) developed a questionnaire called the ELQ. According to these authors, this tool is not confounded by other leadership behaviors and due to its limited number of items, easy to administer. In a separate scale development study, analysis showed that ethical leadership was expressed in two dimensions: empowerment and motive and character clubbed together as second dimension. The study also finds that leaders can be more ethical in a competitive business environment as compared to secure public sector environment (Khuntia and Suar, 2004).

*Critique*

Most researchers use a scale, but there are different scales available; there is no common scale that everybody agrees on. The scales also focus on different conceptualizations of ethical leadership: the ELS and ELQ focus predominantly on the Brown *et al.* (2005) definition whereas the ELW measures ethical leadership from a different perspective altogether. Finally, there is a lack of observational and qualitative studies.
Focus for upcoming research

Existing questionnaires are based on the construct of Brown et al. (2005). If, as argued above, ethical leadership should be conceptualized in a broader sense, a new scale should be developed as well. Moreover, more studies could be done using interviews (see e.g. Heres and Lasthuizen, 2012). Qualitative methods like interviews may help to gain a deeper understanding of the processes underlying ethical leadership.

2.5 Ethical leadership in the public sector

Insights

According to Ospina (2016) and Van Wart (2013) (as quoted in Crosby and Bryson, 2018), research on leadership has expanded recently. However, for the public sector, it is still small, but growing, compared to the vast literature of the private sector. Out of the total 45 studies that are part of this review, 19 studies focus solely on the public sector. Out of these 19 public sector studies, ten studies use the definition of Brown et al. (2005), three studies discuss multiple conceptualizations including that of Brown’s and six studies do not quote any definition. In terms of measurement of ethical leadership, 15 public sector ethical leadership studies use questionnaires (five ELS, four ELQ and six others), 2 studies include review and case studies and one each using secondary data sources and an interview.

In those aspects, research into ethical leadership in the public sector does not differentiate from research in the private sector.

Research focusing on the public sector has contributed much to the mainstream leadership literature. The public leadership scholarship highlights the ever evolving nature of leadership roles and responsibilities crucial for an effective functioning within a public context (Hartley, 2018). Collaborative leadership, the need to develop resilience, political astuteness, maintaining clarity of purpose are some of the vital public leadership attributes highlighted Hartley (2018). On the one hand, it contributes to the general leadership literature, on the other hand, there is overlap between such desired attributes for public leaders and the values upheld by contemporary ethical leadership theories. These contemporary ethical leadership theories propagate similar values of power delegation, looking for answers beyond the prescribed rules, and developing skills such as resilience.
to cope with uncertainty (Hartley, 2018; Van Wart, 2014). A limited construct of ethical leadership without these considerations could hence be inadequate to study the public sector.

Studies into leadership in public sector organizations study organizations like the police, hospitals and fire service departments (Tasdoven and Kaya, 2014; Haraway and Kunselman, 2006; De Wolde et al., 2014; Ali Chughtai, 2016). The studies are from different countries including Turkey, China, Ghana and The Netherlands. One such study (Downe et al., 2016) found that organizations that are involved in good conduct bring forth leaders that replicate those good conducts and who preempt the escalation of problems which in turns help in the reduced use of ethics regulations altogether. Another study conducted in the public sector of two African countries (Yeboah Assiamah et al., 2016) revealed that the ethical behavior of leaders trickles down to lower level employees. The study explains that subordinates’ perception of leader’s behavior creates a group think which floated throughout the organization.

In the public domain, ethical leadership has also been related to public service motivation (PSM). PSM is an individual predisposition to respond to motives grounded primarily or uniquely in public institutions (Perry and Wise, 1990). The study by Wright et al. (2016) shows that supervisors with higher PSM are perceived as ethical leaders by their followers. Ethical leadership in the public sector has also been related to reduced absenteeism, employee willingness to report ethical problems and organizational commitment (Hassan et al., 2014). In another study in which PSM acted as a mediator, ethical leadership was reported to influence employee job performance through the perception of interpersonal justice. Employees with low PSM were highly affected by interpersonal justice (Potipiroon and Faerman, 2016). A study by Thaler and Helmig (2016), which was basically a scenario-based experimental analysis, revealed that ethical leadership had no immediate effect on public employees in the short run but may have in the long term.

Among other authors, Hassan, who along with colleagues helped develop the ELQ (Yukl et al., 2013), conducted studies taking the public sector context into account. In one such study (Hassan, 2015), ethical leadership and personal control were positively related to supervisor rating of subordinate voice behavior after
controlling for factors like employee characteristics, job satisfaction, procedural fairness and performance monitoring. The effect was reported to grow stronger when employees perceived they had high levels of discretion over work behavior and influence over decision in workgroups.

Ethical leadership studies focusing on the public sector have been reported to moderate the relation between pretense and job engagement (Lu and Guy, 2014), and produce tangible efficiency and moral effects in situations of extreme duress (Sanders, 2010). Ethical leadership has also been proven to be an important predictor of performance in the Ugandan public sector (Obicci, 2015). A study that sought to find the gap between ethics theorization and enforcement found that the gap was not due to ethical definition but other leadership, societal and individual variables associated with enforcements (Kate Nwadiogwa Nnabuife, 2010). In the health sector, a study based on a public hospital found that leader-member exchange and psychological empowerment fully mediated the effect of ethical leadership on employee’s creativity (Ali Chughtai, 2016).

Our review also included a paper which highlighted the role of ethical leadership for the office of fire chief/human resource manager who was faced with a situation of political pressure to hire unqualified candidates (Haraway and Kunselman, 2006). A similar study conducted on the Dutch fire service (De Wolde et al., 2014) found that ethical leadership of the fire battalion chief was negatively related to the occurrence of self-reported disobedience of 61 crew commanders. The study showed no significant statistical connection between the three ethical leadership components of moral manager: role model, rewards and discipline, communication about ethics and self-reported organizational behavior. This, the study reveals, could be either because ethical leaders have more influence over unethical behavior of others or that their norms and values fit closely to subordinates values (De Wolde et al., 2014). An ethical leadership study based on Turkish police officers sought to find the perceived seriousness of integrity violations and impact of ethical leadership on integrity and code of silence. The study found that leadership positively affected integrity of police officers and was instrumental in breaking the code of silence in that institution (Tasdoven and Kaya, 2014). Two public sector studies have also been related to negative consequence like unethical pro-organization behavior (UPB) (Miao et al., 2013) and emotional exhaustion (Zheng et al., 2015). See the next section for more details.
Critique
Some authors claim that ethical leadership could be different in public and business settings (see e.g. Heres and Lasthuizen, 2012) but the studies in our review offer little information how different it can be, for instance in terms of the different functions or behaviors of ethical leadership. The similarity between desired attributes of public sector leadership and contemporary ethical leadership theories are, however, not negligible. Such information could also help to determine whether a similar construct of ethical leadership can be used for both the public and the private sector. This will help determine if the existing limited conceptualization of ethical leadership (Brown et al., 2005) is adequate to study it in a public sector context.

Focus for upcoming research
The studies into ethical leadership in the public sector underscore the significance of ethical leadership for public sector organizations. It has been linked to benefits such as reduced absenteeism, tangible efficiency, effectiveness in the long run, but also to negative consequences such as UPB and emotional exhaustion. However, the number of studies into the public sector is quite low, hence more research is necessary. Future research could also make more use of longitudinal and observational research and focus on important public institutions that are to date overlooked, such as the legislature and the judiciary.

2.6 The negative consequences of ethical leadership

Insights
It was not until recently that academics tapped into the negative consequences of ethical leadership. Out of the 45 studies that are part of this review, six are related to negative consequences, two of which deal with the public sector. Lin et al. (2016) conducted empirical research and found that the display of ethical leadership was associated with abusive behavior of the leader toward the followers on the following day. This abusive behavior, the study reveals, is because exhibiting ethical behavior increases leaders’ mental fatigue and moral credits. The leader’s behavior in these studies was measured both by the leaders themselves as well as by the subordinates, thus removing same source bias. In a separate study conducted by Zheng et al. (2015) on military personnel, it was found that team cohesion partially
mediated the relationship between ethical leadership and emotional exhaustion in high moral intensity situations like military operational context.

A study on profit and non-profit organizations (Kalshoven et al., 2016), revealed that ethical leadership can encourage UPB among followers with low autonomy jobs, whereas for followers with high autonomy jobs, ethical leadership was found to encourage UPB through organizational identification. Research also shows that employees’ trust in the leader and surface acting significantly mediated the relationships between ethical leadership and employee burnout, deviant behavior and task performance (Mo and Shi, 2017).

In a similar study based on the public sector, the nature of relationship between ethical leadership and UPB was examined. The findings show that ethical leadership has an inverted U-shaped (curvilinear) relationship with UPB. The study found that as the level of ethical leadership increased from low to moderate, UPB increased, and when ethical leadership increased from moderate to high, UPB decreased. The strength of relationship differed with employees’ identification with supervisor. The strength was stronger when subordinates held higher level of identification with supervisors (Miao et al., 2013). In another study that examined relationship of ethical leadership with deviant behavior and OCB, Stouten et al. (2013) found that high ethical leadership decreased deviant behavior. The participants who volunteered in the experiment study also perceived that high ethical leaders were more morally reproaching to participants’ values. Low ethical leaders were also perceived to morally reproach more than moderate ethical leaders. The authors believed that followers might have felt that way because low ethical leaders might have wanted them to downplay their behavior and adapt to the leader’s low standards. This study also found a curvilinear relation between ethical leadership and OCB. Moderate ethical leaders encouraged OCB more than their low and high counterparts (Stouten et al., 2013).

**Critique**

The studies on negative consequences of ethical leadership leave a lot of unanswered questions. For example, they do not explain how ethical leadership can successfully be strategized to avoid overburdening as well as how to deal with unawareness on the part of managers.
Focus for upcoming research

Ethical leadership does not only bring advantages, but also has a dark side. Attention for these negative aspects is still scarce and only found in the most recent studies. This appears to be a direction that the future research into ethical leadership can focus upon.

2.7 Conclusion

The studies on ethical leadership considered in this review come from a variety of journals including psychology and organization behavior. The diversity of disciplines shows that research into ethical leadership is not limited to a specific discipline. The majority of studies use the definition of Brown et al. (2005). However, this definition seems to be focused only on one part of ethical leadership: the moral manager. Other authors, such as Van Wart (2014) and Kalshoven et al. (2011), have emphasized other and multiple aspects. At this time, a broader definition of ethical leadership that encompasses all these aspects is missing (cf. Dion, 2012). Some of these missing elements also form vital points of consideration for the public sector context making the limited conceptualization and existing scales of ethical leadership inadequate for studies in a public sector context.

A broader definition could also help to settle the discussion about the connection (or overlap) between ethical leadership and other leadership styles such as the transformational and transactional leadership. Ethical leaders likely use both transformational and transactional leadership approaches to influence their followers (Brown et al., 2005). Though they may seem a separate leadership style, the fact that these related styles are used simultaneously, supports the categorization of Van Wart (2014) and the supposition that these theories may in fact all be different dimensions of the same process. There is a dire need for more elaborate conceptualizations.

Earlier research into ethical leadership stressed its positive effects on behaviors and outcomes leading to organizational success, but recent studies also depict a dark side of ethical leadership linking it to abusive behavior on the part of leaders (Lin et al., 2016), emotional exhaustion in high moral intensity contexts like the military (Zheng et al., 2015) or UPB (Kalshoven et al., 2016). Thus, ethical leadership is not all good, rather, it can have negative consequences too. Studies into these dark sides are still rare.
In our review 19 studies focused exclusively on the public sector, implying that more research can and should be done in this context. It can be argued that ethical leadership is even more important for the public sector because it is linked with the trust of the public in these institutions (Haraway and Kunselman, 2006). Ethical leadership has also been linked with PSM. For example, the study by Wright et al. (2016) shows that supervisors with higher PSM are perceived as ethical leaders by their followers. Also, such followers are more likely to report unethical behavior. More research into ethical leadership in the public sector should be done to clarify these matters.

Finally, this study has some limitations that deserve attention here. This review focused on articles in refereed journals and did not include books. Moreover, we selected articles that were published in the last decade and, thus, we may have overlooked frameworks and constructs that were developed by earlier researchers in this field. This review has also paid no attention to antecedents of leadership styles. Research on transformational leadership has focused for example on the role of personality traits (Judge and Bono, 2000; Shao and Webber, 2006). Whether and which personality trait play a role in ethical leadership would be another interesting question for future research.

Lastly, future research could profit from using other methods than surveys, such as interviews and observation (Crosby and Bryson, 2018). Moreover, following the development of a broader concept of ethical leadership, a new and matching measurement scale could be developed and tested. This could perhaps also enable comparative research across countries and cultures.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Serial number</th>
<th>Citations (based on Google scholar)</th>
<th>Name of the paper</th>
<th>Journal</th>
<th>Publication year</th>
<th>Findings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>What does it mean to be responsible? Addressing the missing responsibility dimension in ethical leadership research (C. Voegtlin)</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Responsibility is an important dimension of ethical leadership which aids in informed judgments. It helps with communication, long term and perspective thinking, instilling courage and provides inspiration for change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Reimagining ethical leadership as a relational, contextual and political practice (H. Liu)</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Ethical leadership seen through the lens of feminist, communitarian and corporeal ethic.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Developing a framework for ethical leadership (A. Lawton, I. Páez)</td>
<td>Journal of Business Ethics</td>
<td>2015</td>
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This chapter has been published as
CHAPTER 3

Ethical Leadership as Process:  
A Conceptual Proposition
3.1 Introduction

Studies focusing on ethical leadership attribute its growing importance to the immoral and unprofessional conduct of leaders that looms large nowadays, affecting both public and private sector organizations. According to one report, forced turnover in the world top 2,500 largest public companies due to ethical lapses increased from 3.9% in 2007–2011 to 5.3% in 2012–2016 (Rivera & Karlsson, 2017). However, ethical leadership crises are not new, and the literature on ethical leadership has its roots in ancient as well as recent history and despite decades of research, most papers are normative (Brown & Trevino, 2006; Shakeel, Kruyen, & Van Thiel, 2018).

Ethics scholarship in general and ethical leadership literature in particular have sought to highlight the significant role of ethics for leaders across sectors by conceptualizing ethical leadership in different ways. For instance, the most basic model includes the prime dimensions of the ethical virtues of the leaders themselves and activities that they undertake to inculcate these into followers (Brown, Trevino, & Harrison, 2005). Other models include aspects of contemporary leadership debate including, but not limited to, sustainability (Eisenbeiss, 2012; Kalshoven, Den Hartog, & De Hoogh, 2011a; Voegtlin, 2016).

In the presence of such multiple constructs, the narrative of what constitutes ethical leadership can be found through establishing common grounds; however, a broader perspective is required to achieve it. A broader perspective on the interlinkages between constructs of ethical leadership and related leadership styles suggests the possibility of their coexistence as a process to achieve a common goal, higher ethical values in all styles of leadership. This article is intended as a conceptual study that attempts to answer the question of whether the existing literature provides sufficient evidence for ethical leadership to be studied as a process. If proven, such a processual perspective can help to explain whether ethical leadership is constant or can develop over time—and if so how—and how it relates to other leadership styles. This article is intended as purely argumentative; empirical validation is beyond the scope of this article.

This study assumes that it is important to consider ethical leadership as a process and link it to other leadership styles instead of regarding it as a leadership style of its own. Comprehension as one distinguishable leadership style greatly
undermines the role that ethics play in all leadership theories and styles. Seeing ethical leadership as a process helps to connect the ethical aspects of multiple leadership theories and thus broadens our scope of the role that ethics plays within leadership at large. This article will present and illustrate a pattern for the development of distinct ethical modes of leadership, which will provide important new opportunities for research into ethical leadership.

This study develops the debate of studying ethical leadership as a process by outlining three building blocks as separate sections leading toward processual illustrative models. The first building block contrasts definitions of ethical leadership by Brown et al. (2005) and a broader classification by Van Wart (2014). This leads toward the second building block which includes a new broader definition and timeline of ethical leadership. Third, a timeline is presented in which ethical leadership develops through different steps. Lastly, this article presents its conclusion and recommendations for the future.

3.2 The first building block: Conceptualizations of ethical leadership

Ethical leadership has been conceptualized in different ways, but the definition put forward by Brown et al. (2005) remains popular (see review by Shakeel et al., 2018). Brown et al. (2005, p. 120) define ethical leadership as “the demonstration of normatively appropriate conduct through personal action and interpersonal relationships, and the promotion of such conduct to followers through two-way communication, reinforcement, and decision-making.” This definition implies two main roles of an ethical leader: the moral person and the moral manager. The role of moral person refers to the ethical values of the leader him/herself, whereas the moral manager refers to the activities that the leader undertakes to inculcate such ethical values in followers. The definition stated above mentions three such activities: communication, reinforcement, and decision making. In other studies (e.g., Heres & Lasthuizen, 2012) empowerment is also considered as an integral part of the activities of the moral manager (Den Hartog & De Hoogh 2009; Resick, Hanges, Dickson, & Mitchelson, 2006).

However, the absence of empowerment from this definition is not the only shortcoming of the ethical leadership conceptualization by Brown et al. (2005).
Shakeel et al. (2018) identify at least eight other shortcomings including negative reinforcement; vagueness in defining stakeholders; vagueness in normative appropriateness; no attention for role clarification; no reference to environmental sustainability; capacity for self-improvement; capacity for ethical competence; and withholding necessary transformation (see also Den Hartog, 2015; Eisenbeiss, 2012; Kalshoven et al., 2011a; Voegtlin, 2016). These limitations highlight the shortcomings of ethical leadership as conceptualized by Brown et al. (2005) in definition, construct, and lack of sufficient grounds to identify it as a separate style.

An alternative conceptualization of ethical leadership, which overcomes these shortcomings, is the categorization of ethical leadership into constituent leadership styles by Van Wart (2014). Van Wart lists six leadership styles as contemporary ethical leadership theories. These styles are virtuous leadership; authentic and positive leadership; moral management; professionally grounded leadership; social responsibility leadership; and transformational leadership. These three classifications are also referred to as character; duty; and greatest good, which are termed to be important for good leadership (as a process) to be robust. In essence, this study argues that the constituent leadership styles of Van Wart can be placed on a timeline reflecting a process in which every succeeding style is dependent on the completion (“existence” in this case) of the preceding style. This is discussed in more detail in the upcoming section.

3.3 The Second building block: new definition and timeline

Based on the ideas of Van Wart (2014), Shakeel and colleagues presented a broader definition of ethical leadership incorporating the raised critical points:

Ethical leadership is the implicit and explicit pursuit of desired ethical behavior for self and followers through efforts governed by rules and principles that advocate learning motivation, healthy optimism and clarity of purpose to uphold the values of empowerment, service to others, concern for human rights, change for betterment and fulfilling duties towards society, future generations, environment and its sustainability. (Shakeel et al., 2018, p. 9)
This article will use this broader definition and the categorization of ethical leadership by Van Wart (2014) to create a timeline of the ethical leadership process. This timeline shows the primary difference in the scope of leadership in these related styles through varying focus on external orientation. This external orientation of the leader moves from low to high external orientation. (See Figure 1)

As explained earlier, ethical leadership styles differ from each other in the degree of external orientation of the leader, as shown in Figure 1. This points toward the possibility that leaders can move from one style to the next by taking certain steps, which will be explained in the next section. This section will first discuss the differences in external orientation between the different styles, as illustrated in Table 1.
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**Table 1 External Orientation of Ethical Leadership**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethical leadership Style</th>
<th>Defining characteristic</th>
<th>External stake holders</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Virtuous</td>
<td>Honesty; truthfulness; wisdom</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive and authentic</td>
<td>Open to feedback</td>
<td>Internal only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral manager</td>
<td>Reliance on rules</td>
<td>Internal only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grounded leader</td>
<td>Reliance on ethical principles</td>
<td>Internal only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social responsibility leadership</td>
<td>Total commitment to followers and environment</td>
<td>Internal and external</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational leadership</td>
<td>Identification and implementation of needed change/corrective ethical measure</td>
<td>Internal and external</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Van Wart (2014) portrays virtuous leaders as ethical leaders who focus on their own personal integrity. This conceptualization is similar to the moral person notion of Brown's construct of ethical leadership. Brown et al. (2005) view a moral person as a leader who has ethical qualities but makes no effort to inculcate these qualities in followers (which according to their construct is the role of the moral manager) and instead focuses solely on self-ethics.

Being a virtuous leader is the baseline model for ethical leadership. All succeeding roles and styles have additional qualities. The attributes linked to the minimal virtue are honesty; fairness; wisdom; acknowledgment of mistakes by the leader; opposition of unethical practices; conscientiousness and holding followers accountable (Brown et al., 2005; MacIntyre, 1981; Shakeel et al., 2018). In view of the self-focus of the virtuous leader, this type of leadership is placed on the left side of the timeline of the ethical leadership process with low external focus.

Authentic and positive leaders succeed virtuous leaders in the timeline as they are assumed to be more externally oriented. The evidence of this external orientation lies in the virtues associated with such leadership by scholars. It is also similar to the moral person notion of Brown and colleagues' conceptualization of ethical leadership (Brown et al., 2005; Van Wart, 2014). The attributes associated with these types of leadership are self-awareness; self-improvement; open to feedback; positive influence on self and followers; and being non-defensive. The attribute of openness to feedback and an attempt to influence followers implies engagement with other actors, probably within the organization. This shows a higher degree of external orientation than virtuous leadership.

Succeeding authentic and positive leadership in the timeline of ethical leadership process is the moral manager. It entails activities undertaken by managers to achieve desired ethical outcomes. The attributes associated with moral manager are strict ethical compliance with ethical mandates or organizational rules. The emphasis here is on compliance and reliance on rules. The position of the moral manager on the timeline stems from its role of guiding followers toward ethical outcomes based on rules. It is more externally focused than the positive leader who assesses himself based on an external benchmark (which implies self-correction) and who attempts to influence followers, whereas the moral manager actively guides other followers and hence interacts more with external actors in their goal toward achieving ethical outcome.
Professionally grounded leadership is similar in nature as the moral manager. However, in contrast to moral management, this leadership does not rely on rules and regulations to instill ethics in followers, but instead focuses on legal and organizational principles. It is also associated with the ability to interpret competing sources of authority and focus on aspiration rather than rules (Van Wart, 2014). To clarify the distinction between the moral manager and the professionally grounded leader, Shakeel et al. (2018) explain that if a leader makes a decision based on rules, he/she would be following the Brown et al. (2005) notion of moral management, but if he makes decisions which have no precedence or associating rule for guidance, theoretically, she will be acting as a professionally grounded leader. Since principles are prospectively broader and more generalized than rules, this article assumes professionally grounded leaders to be more externally oriented than moral managers.

The next position in the timeline of ethical leadership is that of the socially responsible leader which includes servant leadership, spiritual leadership, and corporate social responsibility (CSR). Servant leadership aims to serve the actors related to the organization and has care and compassion as key attributes. Spiritual leaders see their work as a “higher calling” and display sacrificing behavior, whereas CSR focuses on the broader society and environment and values sustainability (Turker, 2009; Van Wart, 2014). Since aspects of socially responsible leaders show a greater focus (through acts like sacrifice) on follower development and aspects beyond organization including society and environment, they are considered to have more external orientation compared to the leadership styles discussed earlier. A more precise distinction between servant and spiritual leadership is beyond the scope of this study, but it emphasizes the distinction between these two and CSR, which, as indicated by the title, focuses on actors beyond the organization including the broader society and environment.

Van Wart (2014) considers transformational leadership the “proper ends” of ethical leadership. Other ethical leadership studies, such as that of Brown et al. (2005), characterized the overlap between the conceptualization of ethical leadership and transformational leadership partial at best. However, this article stresses the central role in ethical propagation of transformational leadership attributes, such as undertaking actual changes within organizations to adapt to growing needs of the organization as well as society—for example, the transition to environmentally
friendly methods of doing business (sustainability). On this basis, it can be seen as an important outcome of the process and assume it as the highest externally orientated form of ethical leadership.

3.4 The Third building block: Steps of the ethical leadership process

The process in which leaders’ external orientation increases and leaders can move from one form of ethical leadership to the next on the time line depends on their taking specific steps. This is illustrated in Figure 2.

Figure 2 shows a process consisting of six broad steps, which are associated with the corresponding leadership styles from Figure 1. Again, the order of the steps depicts an increasing external orientation. This implies that ethical leadership development starts with self-focus, grows into utmost dedication toward followers and other external factors, and concludes into commitment to initiating change of the status quo.

The first step of the process starts with individual ethics, and the role of the leader is to focus on developing ethical skills. The source of adopting an ethical lifestyle could be external and internal drivers as evident from the social learning theory implied in ethical leadership by seminal authors (Brown et al., 2005). However, the personal wisdom associated with virtuous leadership is the primary factor of ethical behavior. At this point, the leader does not make any efforts to instill these qualities into followers, so it is assumed that, willingly, there is no point of external contact. Since there is no active role on the part of the virtuous leader in question to engage with external actors, his/her focus remains narrow.

In the second step, the general focus on ethical behavior is still limited to the leader herself. However, there is a new development in behavior setting it apart from virtuous leadership. At this stage, the leader willingly opts to have his ethical behavior analyzed by external actors for feedback (Van Wart, 2014, p. 29) thus providing a benchmark for ethical behavior. Input in the form of feedback can be seen as the first point of contact with external actors; hence, the higher external orientation.

Before the third stage, leaders make efforts to develop their own ethical behavior. In the third step, however, the leader starts to instill this learned ethical behavior
in followers. This dissemination of ethical knowledge is the second point of contact with external stakeholders. It fits with the role of moral management as described by Brown et al. (2005). However, the focus of moral management is assumed to be only on employees within the organization. The source of ethical guidance to steer toward desired ethical behavior comes predominantly from the existing rules and regulations of the organization (Van Wart, 2014).

The fourth step of the process marks its existence only in terms of improved skills with no big change depicted in external orientation. Professionally grounded leaders and moral managers are both assumed to govern employees toward ethical behavior through their functional roles. It is also probable that they cater to the same extent of external actors. However, in this step principles guide a leader’s behavior more than rules. This competency can indicate being governed by such guidelines that include both aspirational codes and operational assistance (Meine & Dunn, 2013). In a study that attempts to distinguish between rules and principles, Braithwaite (2002) asserts that when the type of action that needs to be regulated is simple, stable, and does not involve huge economic interests, rules tend to regulate with greater certainty than principles (Braithwaite, 2002, p. 75), whereas when the type of action to be regulated is complex, changing, and involves large economic interests, principles tend to regulate with greater certainty than rules (Braithwaite, 2002, p. 75).

This step does not imply that following principles depicts a higher moral position compared to following rules alone; instead it reflects the increased focus on external orientation. There are no studies that have empirically proven higher moral grounds for individuals possessing or following certain ethical principles. The intent to separate the two steps is focused solely on the specificity and generic nature of the two in terms of external orientation as stated in Braithwaite (2002).

Figure 2 Steps of ethical leadership process.
As problems best solved through principles are more complex than those best solved by rules, it is safe to assume that grounded leaders are trained and developed more in terms of new skills learned to handle complex problems. For a moral manager to handle complex problems, she will need these added skills and experience. Such skills relate to ethical competence (Shakeel et al., 2018)—an aspect that can be addressed through leaders’ learning.

The fifth step in the ethical leadership process is related to leadership behavior that is pre-dominantly focused on the self-actualization of followers, and how the leader can help them to achieve their goals. This implies a certain servitude or even sacrifice on the part of the leader and his utmost dedication toward his followers and the broader social environment.

Finally, the last step of the ethical leadership process is concerned with achieving change, which can be both inside and outside the organization, of the organizational culture, as well as change aimed at achieving ethical needs outside of the organization. In this step, a leader will develop and implement a plan of action to achieve changes that are considered necessary from an ethics perspective.

This sequence is an incomplete mapping of numbered leadership styles and does not represent an exhaustive list of such. Moreover, the distinctions between the styles are merely educated arguments to feed the processual discussion within this domain and remain to be proved empirically.

3.5 Concentric circles of ethical leadership

Figures 1 and 2 present the idea that ethical leadership can take on different forms, and that there is a step-wise evolution in ethical leadership behavior. To be sure, this implies that a leadership style higher on the timeline and/or further in the step-wise evolution builds on elements from leadership styles lower on the timeline and step-wise development. To illustrate this, Figure 3 presents a model of concentric circles. The inner most circle represents the virtuous leadership, which depicts the ethics of the individual leader central to the process as well as the primary role that it plays in the process. The next circle of authentic and positive leadership illustrates that this leadership, besides its own new roles, already includes the roles and attributes of virtuous leadership. This essentially can be
explained such that all positive and authentic leaders are virtuous leaders but not otherwise. The grounded leadership also includes the capacity to make decisions based on principles, but has all the attributes of moral management embedded within. The outermost circle represents ethical transformational leadership, which includes the attributes of all the previous styles of ethical leadership.

Figure 3 Concentric circles of ethical leadership.

### 3.6 The ethical leadership quadrant

So far, ethical leadership has been discussed as a positive concept, and worthwhile to achieve or developed through, for example, following the steps in Figure 2. However, recently, some new research has been published (Miao, Newman, Yu, & Xu, 2013; Mo & Shi, 2017; Zheng et al., 2015), showing that ethical leadership can also have negative effects, and that not all leaders are ethical leaders. For instance, leaders, at any point in their development, can use their situation, power, and context to their advantage to pursue selfish needs and goals (Barling, Christie, & Turner, 2008).
It is assumed that each leadership style has such a darker version—for example, pseudo-transformational leadership involves undergoing and/or implementing a change that serves the leader rather than followers or society (Barling et al., 2008, p. 859). For example, when international businesses use raw materials or import finished goods from developing countries, and the production of those materials or goods involves child labor, the leader can decide to ignore this. He would then be following the laws of his own organization—and thus be an ethical leader—but at the same time, his behavior could also be considered to be not very ethical from a wider perspective.

Studies into ethical leadership are now exploring the dark sides of ethical leadership. In their review, Shakeel, Kruyen and Van Thiel (2016) discuss studies that attribute the negative effects of ethical leadership to an overemphasis on ethics. This can lead to, for example, moral over-exhaustion (Zheng et al., 2015) or unethical pro-organizational behavior (UPB) (Miao et al., 2013; Mo & Shi, 2017).

The existence of this dark side raises questions regarding the process of ethical leadership presented so far. To discuss this, a two-dimensional quadrant (Figure 4) is presented here. The $x$-axis of this illustration comes from the timeline of ethical leadership, and indicates the level of external orientation from low to high. The $y$-axis indicates the level of ethics portrayed through the leader behavior, also ranging from low (negative) to high (positive). Together, this leads to four quadrants, each of which is supposed to represent a different leadership role.

The low-left hand quadrant depicts a narcissistic unethical leader, who has low values on ethics and serves only his self-interest. The high-left hand quadrant points to a virtuous leader, who follows ethical discourse herself, but is not concerned with the external environment or her followers. The high-right hand quadrant depicts an ethical transformational leader, who not only limits herself to follower guidance, but also undertakes implementation of a wider discourse for ethical causes. The low-right hand quadrant points to an unethical pseudotransformation leader, who uses external and internal actors within the organization, and/or implements a wider agenda to fulfill selfish schemes. Pseudotransformational leaders are described as those who “advance their own self-interested agendas by dominating and controlling their followers. In focusing on self-interest, pseudotransformational leaders are more interested in becoming personal idols than in
the collective ideals that might benefit their followers” (Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999, cited in Barling et al., 2008, p. 852).

Figure 4 also shows the moral manager and professional grounded leadership in the middle. This is because: (a) there are no studies that explore the dark side for these styles (for either of them), and (b) ethical leadership conceptualization (with a focus on moral management) is also predicted to use multiple styles based on their role and the nature of the organization that they serve (Heres & Lasthuizen, 2012). Earlier, a difference was discussed between moral managers and grounded leaders (following Van Wart, 2014), which showed that moral managers focus more on rules and grounded leaders more on principles. It could be argued that in the initial stages of follower guidance, leaders make more use of ethical rules, and hence, the role of moral management is more dominant in the start of the process. This is shown by placing the moral management toward the left side in the figure. Toward the end of the process, when leaders are required to solve ethical dilemmas and implement an ethical discourse, professionally grounded leadership is assumed to play a more active role. This is shown by placing grounded leadership toward the right side of the figure.

The quadrant does not include all ethical leadership styles. More elaboration is necessary but beyond the scope of this contribution. More recommendations for future research are offered in the final section of this article.
3.7 Discussion and research agenda

Ethical leadership was seen as a distinct style by scholars like Brown et al. (2005), but the categorization of ethical leadership into constituent styles by Van Wart (2014) has paved the way for ethical leadership to be studied as a process with different steps of development. Such a processual approach can also be helpful in explaining the relationship between the different styles of ethical leadership. The interdependence of these constituent styles on each other for their smooth functioning is also testimonial to the processual approach. Just as the moral management cannot completely function to its desired capacity if the moral person (similar to virtuous leadership) is not present (Brown et al., 2005); in a similar way, transformational leadership cannot achieve its desired outcome unless virtuous leadership qualities are also present. This study asserts that the presence of pseudotransformational leaders also adds evidence to this assumption.

Moreover, the linkage of leadership theory to learning (Brown & Posner, 2001) further validates that leadership can be a similar process of continued learning and adapting to the new challenges. The quadrant and the concentric circles of ethical leadership shown in this study help understand the process and indicate
that ethical leadership can be seen as a process instead of a distinct style of its own, but additional empirical studies are needed to validate this conclusion. This study is not without its limitations. The timeline of ethical leadership lists only a few related ethical leadership styles and is not an exhaustive list. Furthermore, it is certainly not asserted that transformational leadership is the end of this process. As leadership is associated with learning (Brown & Posner, 2001), which is an ongoing and continuous process, the implementation of required ethical transformational changes lead to the resumption of the process from one of the stages again. This model fails to indicate when the process restarts; more research is needed to verify this proposition.

In a similar pattern, the quadrants show only numbered styles, and offer a limited account of corresponding negative attitudes. The corresponding negative side to grounded leadership or moral management is not part of the model, due to lack of credible research evidence. These aspects warrant further research to develop this model.

Future research can focus on various aspects of the process. The process of ethical leadership with the proposed model can be empirically proven by validating the broader ethical leadership scale developed by Shakeel et al. (2018). This can help verify the processual nature of ethical leadership and will help establish the validity of ethical leadership as a process. For the empirical results to prove the process true, individuals' external orientation scores should depict a pattern similar to that of the sequence on the timeline. Future studies could also explore whether rules indeed fit best for lower management levels and principles for higher management levels because of more complexity of decisions at the top. Alternatively, it could be studied whether the effect and use of ethical rules and principles are different for different sectors (e.g., public versus private sector).

Another line of inquiry could be related to antecedent factors of ethical leadership. Although previous research into ethical leadership has established linkages to personality traits (Kalshoven, Den Hartog, & De Hoogh, 2011b; Walumbwa & Schaubroeck, 2009; Xu, Yu, & Shi, 2011); in terms of our model, interesting avenues include discovering which personality traits are related, or necessary, to various steps along the timeline of ethical leadership. This could also help in tailored leader-development training programs for leaders along these steps.
Studies can also explore where historically important political and apolitical personalities stood in their development stage as leaders by studying their decisions and impact on followers. For example, it would be interesting to know if Dr. Martin Luther King Jr. was ethically transformational; Mahatma Gandhi a servant; and Mother Teresa a spiritual leader, and if they followed a leader development path visible through their actions and decisions in accordance with the model proposed through this paper.
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CHAPTER 4

Development of a Broader Conceptualization and Measurement Scale of Ethical Leadership (BELS)
4.1 Introduction

The increasing body of literature on ethical leadership (Eisenbeiss, 2012; Den Hartog, 2015, Brown et al., 2006) reports on the various positive effects of ethical leadership such as reduction in absenteeism (Hassan et al., 2014), lower turnover intention (Demirtas and Akdogan, 2015; Elci et al., 2012), and higher motivation for whistle blowing (Bhal and Dadhich, 2011). However, a closer look at the literature reveals that studies pertaining to ethical leadership uphold different conceptualizations of ethical leadership. This is problematic because the presence of multiple conceptualizations hampers the accumulation of knowledge and results in unnecessary proliferation of constructs (Blalock, 1968; Tesser and Kraus, 1976 as cited in Singh, 1991). In general, these different conceptualizations can be classified into a classical and a contemporary school of thought.

The classical school of thought includes studies that uphold the view that ethical leadership comprises of personal ethical virtues of a leader and lists activities undertaken by them to inculcate these values into followers. These studies portray a two-dimensional view of ethical leadership as developed by Brown et al. (2005); Trevino et al. (2003); and Trevino et al. (2000). These two dimensions are called the moral person which refers to the virtues of the leader, and moral manager which refers to the efforts undertaken by leaders through various means to promote such virtues (Brown et al., 2005). This conceptualization remains popular in the literature till today, and has paved the way for a large number of empirical studies.

The contemporary conceptualization of ethical leadership includes studies that promote a broader scope of ethical leadership (e.g., Kalshoven et al., 2011; Eisenbeiss, 2012; Van Wart, 2014; Voegtlin, 2016). The common underlying denominator in these modern contemporary thoughts of ethical leadership includes two broad views which put them in contrast to classical views. First, in contrast to the classical school of thoughts, contemporary theories of ethical leadership put more emphasis on the external environment and, second, the role of leader is shifted from being a manager that manages employees with rewards and punishments to a mentor that inspires followers by putting the followers’ needs before their own (Van Wart, 2014).

A comparison of the classical and contemporary conceptualizations of ethical leadership shows that, on the one hand, the classical ethical leadership
conceptualization lacks many values including efforts on the part of leaders to prioritize the needs of employees or take responsibility for society and environment (Eisenbeiss, 2012; Voegtlin, 2016). On the other hand, contemporary conceptualizations do not include an outline of activities needed to address these growing responsibilities. Therefore, in this study, we aim to develop an overarching conceptualization of ethical leadership that combines both elements.

Next to the absence of an overarching conceptualization, ethical leadership scholarship also lacks an overarching measurement tool. Questionnaires that are currently in use either judge leaders on classical assumptions or measure modern values ignoring the basics of classical theories. This study addresses the call to compare different ethical leadership scales (Yukl et al., 2013), and creates a new scale which will help to address a broader conceptualization.

This article is structured as follows. First, we develop the broader conceptualization of ethical leadership using two building blocks. The first building block reviews elements that were found lacking in the classical model as suggested in the extant literature on ethical leadership. The second building block discusses elements from the contemporary conceptualizations. In the discussion that follows, we explicate how repetitive and similar attributes are removed as part of the development of a broader conceptualization. Based on these building blocks, we next put forward a new broader ethical leadership definition. Following this definition, we then construct the broader ethical leadership scale (BELS) using an amalgam of existing scales and self developed items from the literature. The article ends with a discussion of the utility of the broader conceptualization and the BELS, and presents a future research agenda on ethical leadership.

4.2 Building Block 1

Criticizing the Classical Ethical Leadership Conceptualization

The classical conceptualization of ethical leadership was first presented by Trevino et al. (2000; Trevino et al., 2003). This has been further developed and defined by Brown and colleagues (2005). In their study, they define ethical leadership as “the demonstration of normatively appropriate conduct through personal action and interpersonal relationships, and the promotion of such conduct to followers through two-way communication, reinforcement, and decision-making” (Brown et
al., 2005, p.120). This conceptualization attributes ethical leadership as the sum of two dimensions; the moral person and moral manager.

The moral person dimension refers to the personal attributes of the leader her/himself, for example, honesty, fairness, integrity and the leader’s decision-making which includes consideration for ethical consequences of decisions, and making principled and fair choices that can be observed and emulated by others (Bass & Avolio, 2000; Burns, 1978; Howell & Avolio, 1992 as cited in Brown et al., 2005). The moral manager refers to the activities that the manager undertakes to inculcate these values in followers. These activities include role modeling, communication about ethics, and reinforcements (Brown et al., 2005).

Role modeling refers to making the behaviour and decision-making of the leader visible and salient for observation by followers against an observational background which is neutral at best (Brown and Trevino, 2006, p. 597 as cited in Heres and Lasthuizen, 2012). Communication herein implies that leaders “not only draw attention to ethics and make it salient in the social environment by explicitly talking to followers about it, but they also provide followers with voice, a procedurally or interpersonally just process” (Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999; Howell & Avolio, 1992 as cited in Brown et al., 2005). The reinforcement component refers to leaders setting，“ethical standards, reward ethical conduct and discipline those who don't follow the standards” (Gini, 1998; Trevino et al., 2003 as cited in Brown et al., 2005).

This conceptualization has been at the base of many empirical studies, however, the classical model lacks a number of contemporary values. We highlight seven points of discussion, being focus on negative reinforcement, stakeholders not defined, lack of consideration for empowerment, ambiguity in normative appropriateness, lack of role clarification, lack of consideration for environmental sustainability and need for leader learning. Figure 1 shows the classical model of ethical leadership lacking the above-mentioned contemporary values.
Stage 1: Development of Classical Model
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Figure 1: The Classical Model of Ethical Leadership

Stage 1: Development of Classical Model

Focus on Negative Reinforcement. Within the classical ethical leadership conceptualization, the moral management dimension includes role modeling, communication about ethics and reinforcement to guide followers towards ethical actions. Reinforcement refers to leaders’ disciplining the behaviour of followers towards the desired ethical conduct by the means of rewards and punishment (Heres and Lasthuizen, 2012). This experience lies with the observers as well as individuals being rewarded or punished (Trevino et al., 1992; Brown et al., 2005; Mayer et al., 2009 as cited in Heres and Lasthuizen, 2012). The focus on punishment is problematic, due to the implications on an employee’s well-being as it can have a negative effect on employees’ self-esteem. A lower self-esteem is negatively related to performance (Covin et al., 1992; Pierce and Gardner, 2004). This has also been cited in the classic conceptualization (Kanungo and Mendonca, 1996 as cited in Brown et al., 2005).
Stakeholders Not Defined. Stakeholders are defined as: “any identifiable group or individual who can affect the achievement of an organization’s objectives or who is affected by the achievement of an organization’s objectives. Stakeholders include, for example, public interest groups, protest groups, government agencies, trade associations, competitors, unions, as well as employees, customer segments, and shareowners” (Freeman & Reed, 1983, p. 91).

Several scholars argue that the classical conceptualization of ethical leadership (Brown et al., 2005) does not focus on external stakeholders like customers and society (Den Hartog, 2015, p.112; Frisch and Huppenbauer, 2014 in Voegtlin, 2016). This argument stems from the lack of reference to external stakeholders in the definition. However, it is important to consider stakeholders as they are important components of an organization. The initial model of ethical leadership put forward by Trevino et al. (2000) did include the sub dimension of concern for society as part of moral person dimension of the construct. However subsequent studies did not identify the scope of ethical leader in its definition or measurement tool (Brown et al., 2005).

Lack of Consideration for Empowerment. Scholars describe empowerment as “allowing followers a say in decision making and listening to their ideas and concerns” (De Hoogh and den Hartog, 2008, p.298). The classical conceptualization of ethical leadership lacks direct and explicit attention for empowerment although empowerment has been a topic of discussion in related terms of ‘giving employees voice’ in the classical theory (Brown et al., 2005). Recent studies on ethical leadership emphasize its importance and have found empowerment to be a vital component of the moral manager dimension (Resick et al., 2006; Den Hartog and De Hoog, 2009 as cited in Heres and Lasthuizen, 2012). According to these scholars, ethical leaders give chances to their employees to voice their concerns, become a part of the decision-making process and help them set their goals. The study by De Hoogh and Den Hartog (2008) suggest that empowerment has importance in studies relating to high performance work systems (Becker & Huselid, 1998 as cited in De Hoogh and Den Hartog, 2008).

Lack of Normative Appropriateness. Classical conceptualizations use the term ‘normatively appropriate’ for desired ethical behaviour. Although individual ethics are normative in general and vary with cultural boundaries, in terms
of organizational studies ethical leadership needs to address the nature of normativeness. In light of the debate regarding unethical pro-organization behaviour (Kalshoven et al., 2016), the extent of normativeness merits a definition of its organizational boundaries. Other studies (Frisch and Huppenbauer, 2014; Den Hartog, 2015) also raise concerns about the term ‘normatively appropriate’ used in the definition of ethical leadership by Brown and colleagues (2005). These scholars argue that norms may vary across organizations and industries and there is no identification regarding who sets these norms. Furthermore, such norms may even be harmful for others. The classical conceptualization (Brown et al., 2005) lacks clarification about the normative nature of conduct.

Lack of Role Clarification. Role clarification refers to transparency by leaders in clarifying performance goals and expectations for followers (De Hoogh & Den Hartog, 2008; Kalshoven, 2011). Classical conceptualizations do not address this important function of moral management (De Hoogh & Den Hartog, 2008; Kalshoven et al, 2011). Role clarification was used along with power sharing and morality and fairness by De Hoogh and Den Hartog (2008) in their study to assess ethical leadership and adapted by Kalshoven et al. (2011) as part of their construct. In their studies, De Hoogh and Den Hartog (2008) and Kalshoven et al. (2011) identified role clarification among ethical leader behaviors. Ethical leaders are expected to help employees identify their roles within the organizations. This is important to take into consideration as lack of role clarity can create false expectations in terms of individual responsibility and can hamper good performance. Employees can judge when their performance is at par, and it also helps to avoid employees worrying unnecessarily about their performance (Kalshoven et al., 2011). The definition by Brown et al. (2005) lacks the acknowledgement of role clarification as part of ethical leader’s responsible behavior.

Lack of Environmental Sustainability. Corporate sustainability can be defined as meeting the needs of a firm’s direct and indirect stakeholders (such as shareholders, employees, clients, pressure groups, communities, etc.), without compromising its ability to meet the needs of future stakeholders as well. Towards this goal, organizations have to maintain and grow their economic, social and environmental capital base while actively contributing to sustainability in the political domain (Dyllicks & Hockerts, 2002, p.132). Although this definition focuses on the political domain, we think it holds true beyond this frame as sustainability as mandate
transcends political motives. Contemporary ethical leadership scholars (Van Wart, 2014; Eisenbeiss, 2012; Voegtlin, 2016) promote environmental sustainability as a factor of ethical leadership whereas the classical conceptualization (Brown et al., 2005) does not share this concern. We argue that implicit in the theory of ethical leadership is the understanding that ethical leaders are responsible individuals (Eisenbeiss, 2012). This implies a responsibility to both internal and external stakeholders including the society and environment. Having established this, ethical leaders are compelled to be conscious about their surroundings including the environment and its sustainability. Concern for sustainability has also been identified by De Hoogh and Den Hartog (2008) and subsequently by Kalshoven et al. (2011). By not clearly identifying stakeholders, as discussed above, the implicit thoughts about environmental sustainability are left undecided in the classical conceptualizations (Brown et al., 2005).

Need for Leader Learning. Leadership learning refers to the knowledge that the leader needs to possess in order to lead effectively and adapt constantly to the changing environment. According to Voegtlin (2016), it is an important aspect of leader responsibility. It also implies knowledge in terms of ethical behaviours. Both classical and contemporary conceptualizations lack focus addressing this important aspect of leadership. In a study that explored the link between learning and leadership (Brown and Posner, 2001), leadership development was termed a learning process. Application of adult learning and fostering transformational learning were considered essential in the design and delivery of leadership development efforts. With regard to this important aspect of leadership, the definition of an ethical leader by Brown and colleagues (Brown et al., 2005) overlooks the importance for self-improvement through learning for either the ethical leaders themselves or the followers. This is in line with the qualities of reconsideration associated with leaders (Hester, 2012). We believe learning can imply going through a process of reconsideration which can be result of training, experiences, or formal education.

Figure 2 represents the two dimensions of classical model as depicted in figure 1 with the addition of contemporary values as outlined above.
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Figure 2: Classical Model of Ethical Leadership Including Contemporary Values

4.3 Building Block 2: Ethical Components of Other Leadership Styles

The broader ethical leadership conceptualization that is developed in this study not only considers critical points raised by contemporary ethical leadership scholars but also uses insights from five related leadership styles. These styles are positive, spiritual, transformational and professionally grounded leadership. Although classical theory negates the possibility to link transformational style to ethical leadership but acknowledges the link (Brown et al., 2005), it does not discuss the association with the other four styles mentioned in this section. Van Wart (2014) in his study considers these leadership styles as contemporary ethical leadership theories. Their crucial role in ethical leadership include a focus on individual ethics, fostering resilience, advocating for diversity and equal rights, stress on ethical principles instead of total reliance on rules (grounded leadership) and change in terms of adaptation of needed ethical perspective (Shakeel et al., 2019).
Virtuous Leadership. Virtuous leadership as characterized by Van Wart (2014) is similar to the moral person in the classical conceptualization of ethical leadership. In both classifications, it refers to a person who has particular ethical attributes. In terms of the classical conceptualization, it refers to a person who is considered fair, trustworthy, honest and caring (Brown et al., 2005). Care is also at the epicenter of values deemed important for leaders within the leadership literature (Hester, 2012). However, the moral person does not actively pursue to instill these attributes in followers; this is a job for moral manager (the second dimension of ethical leadership according to the classical conceptualization). A virtuous leader has attributes such as honesty, trustworthiness, fairness conscientiousness and prudence (Van Wart, 2014, p.29). Prudence or wisdom according to Van Wart (2014) can be used for understanding why things are the way they are. It refers to blending experience, knowledge and reason to make optimum or prudential decisions (Kodish, 2006 in Van Wart, 2014).

Attention for Resilience (Link to Positive Leadership). Resilience is termed as the “ability to bounce back from adversity” (Hartley, 2018, p. 211) and has been deemed useful for public sector leadership. However, this study proposes it to be central to the concept of ethical leadership in general. According to the literature, resilience is of two types; preventive and restorative (Hartley, 2018). Preventive resilience deals with building the capacity to deal with adverse situation whereas restorative resilience deals with bringing a person back to normalcy after a stressful period (Hartley, 2018). Preventive resilience is directly related to ‘ethical competence’ of the leader, which involves training the leader to follow inspiration and professional principles to cope with unexpected situations and ethical dilemmas when rules do not guide appropriately or are unavailable (discussed in upcoming section). Whereas, restorative resilience is instrumental in avoiding ethical lapses in high stress situation. This calls for special attention as abusive behaviour has been linked with stressful situations within ethical leadership literature (Lin et al., 2016).

Addressing Diversity Management (Link to Socially Responsible Leadership). Diversity management is defined as “the commitment on the part of organizations to recruit, retain, reward, and promote a heterogeneous mix of productive, motivated, and committed workers including people of color, whites, females, and the physically challenged (Ivancevich and Gilbert, 2000, p.77). Ethical leaders being responsible individuals, and governed by the principles of fairness and justice are expected
to give equal representation and opportunities to all stakeholders in all matters of organization. Although the classic conceptualization of ethical leadership does not focus explicitly on diversity, diversity constitutes a vital component of spiritual leadership (Van Wart, 2014).

**Professionally Grounded Leadership.** Among the contemporary theories of ethical leadership is professionally grounded leadership (Van Wart, 2014) which is also in line with Voegtlin’s (2016) work on ethical leadership. The grounded approach focuses on ethical principles whereas the moral manager focuses more on rules and regulations (Van Wart, 2014). If an ethical leader decides based on rules, (s)he would be following the classical conceptualization of ethical leadership; whereas if an ethical leader is forced to decide which has no precedence or associating rule for guidance, theoretically (s)he will be a professionally grounded ethical leader. In our study, we call the ability of following principles “ethical competence.” This is similar to addressing the issue highlighted by a leadership study, “that socialization and training in ethical decision-making ought to become a consistent practice” (Hester, 2012, p.8).

**Ethical Component of Transformational Leadership.** On a similar note, responsibility on the part of ethical leaders also maintains that ethical leaders in their conscious mind, save budget restraints, will not withhold transformational changes in the organization which could increase productivity or benefit their organization in the long run. Brown et al. (2005) reviewed the overlap between transformational and ethical leadership and stated that this overlap at best is partial. However, there are two known types within transformational leadership; authentic transformational leaders who can be termed as leaders true to their agenda of undergoing change and pseudo-transformational leaders who use change to pursue selfish needs (Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999).

In contrast to the classical school of thought, we are of the view that the association of ethical leadership and authentic transformational leadership is not a mere overlap but that ethical leaders are known to use various styles depending on the context (Heres and Lasthuizen, 2012). We argue that ethical leadership as proposed by Van Wart’s categorization (2014) entails social responsibility styles including Corporate social responsibility (CSR) leading to environmental sustainability and transformational leadership styles. Having incorporated the categorization by Van Wart (2014) into our development, currently our model is illustrated in Figure 3.
Figure 3 shows the components of ethical leadership that have been covered so far. The dimensions of moral person and moral manager have been added from classical school of thought; Responsibility is included in our broader model to compensate for the lack of clarity on the definition of “normative appropriateness” in the model presented by Brown et al. (2005). Responsibility also stands as a dimension of ethical leadership from the study of Voegtlin (2016). We add contemporary ideas of empowerment, need for leader learning and sustainability from our discussion and the remaining 6 dimensions from Van Wart’s (2014) categorization including virtuous leadership, authentic and positive leadership, moral management, professionally grounded leadership, socially responsible leadership and transformational leadership. However, these 12 dimensions include some overlap that we discuss in the upcoming section, before presenting our broader definition of ethical leadership.

4.4 Broader Ethical Leadership Definition

Although contemporary studies pose critique on the multiple shortcomings of the classical assumptions of ethical leadership, these studies are limited to the proposition of new dimensions of ethical leadership with no emphasis on the specific list of activities it comprises (as are part of moral management of the classical assumption). Enlisting activities of these dimensions can help distinguish them from each other as well as avoid repetition. For example, responsibility is implicit in the classical conceptualization and is also a separate explicit dimension.
identified by Voegtlin (2016). The sub-dimension of responsibility includes links to multiple other contemporary concepts. For instance, it has links to the grounded leadership characterization of Van Wart (2014), with empowerment, with need for learning and with social responsibility leadership of Van Wart, 2014.

*Figure 4* demonstrates overlaps between dimensions. For example, the moral person dimension of classical ethical leadership is similar to virtuous leadership, and sustainability is part of CSR which is a socially responsible leadership style in Van Wart's categorization. Other examples concern empowerment and role clarification, which are added to moral management, whereas concerns relating to the need for learning and sustainability are addressed through the dimensions of professionally grounded and socially responsible leadership respectively. Responsibility, which is an important dimension of ethical leadership by Voegtlin (2016), is seen as a vital factor of all dimensions of ethical leadership. We have used it above to compensate for the lack of clarity of ‘normative appropriateness’ and we think it also addresses the shortcoming regarding identification of relevant stakeholders. This is possible as the dimension of socially responsible leadership identifies society as well as environment among external stakeholders.

*Figure 4. Ethical Leadership Dimensions*
So, all shortcomings of the classical perspective mentioned are covered in the model presented in Figure 4 and we can now present a new, broader definition of ethical leadership: “Ethical leadership is the implicit and explicit pursuit of desired ethical behavior for self and followers through efforts governed by rules and principles that advocate learning motivation, healthy optimism and clarity of purpose to uphold the values of empowerment, service to others, concern for human rights, change for betterment and fulfilling duty towards society, future generations, environment and its sustainability.”

Embedded within this definition are the approaches of six constituent ethical leadership styles including virtuous leadership, authentic and positive leadership, moral manager, professionally grounded leadership, social responsibility leadership (including CSR, spiritual servant leadership) and transformational leadership (Van Wart, 2014). These approaches will form the basis for the development of the Broad Ethical Leadership Scale (BELS).

4.5 Scale Construction

The BELS has been developed as an amalgam of existing scales of the constituent styles of ethical leadership. The Ethical Leadership Scale (ELS) and the Ethical Leadership Questionnaire are based on classical conceptualization of ethical leadership, whereas, the Ethical Leadership at Work (ELW) is based on contemporary conceptualization. An exhaustive list of scales that were used to import items is shown in Table 1. For authentic and positive leadership, professionally grounded leadership, and spiritual leadership no items could be found in the literature. We developed items ourselves using the study of Van Wart (2014). For the items that were imported from existing scales, only those with factor loadings above 0.4 were considered for incorporation. Overlapping items were also removed to avoid repetitions. We chose to formulate the items in such a way that leaders rate themselves on a Likert scale, therefore, we decided to add items to assess social desirability and formulate a few items negatively (as most items were formulated positively).

In the appendix we provide the tool including items from the social desirability scale as well as negatively coded items for some of the existing items from BELS of our scale. The negatively coded items include “Do not believe that sustainability is
a vital function for a good leader” (reverse of transformational leadership) “Believe that only rules are not enough” (reverse of moral manager), “I assign tasks to employees based on my personal preferences” (reverse of virtuous leadership), “I like to be treated with the respect that I deserve based on my position” (reverse of servant leadership) and “I am pessimist” (reverse of positive leadership). The social desirability scale (Hays et al., 1989) consists of items, “I am always polite to people, even if they are not friendly,” “I have once taken advantage of someone, Sometime I would rather take revenge than to forgive and forget”, “I sometime feel indignant if I do not get my way” and “I am a good listener, regardless of who I talk to.” These items were added to allow control analyses and counter potential response errors.
Figure 5. Item-wise Detail of BELS

Development of Broader ethical leadership scale (BELS):

- **Virtuous leadership**
  - Show strong concern for ethical and moral values
  - Am honest and can be trusted to tell the truth
  - Am fair and unbiased when assigning tasks to members
  - Exercise sound reasoning in deciding on the optimal course of action
  - Insist on doing what is fair and ethical even when it is not easy
  - Acknowledge mistakes and take responsibility for them
  - Regard honesty and integrity as important personal values
  - Oppose the use of unethical practices to increase performance
  - Hold members accountable for using ethical practices in their work

- **Authentic and positive leadership**
  - Keep my actions consistent with my stated values
  - Am aware of my personal values
  - Can be trusted to carry out promises and commitments
  - Am resilient in nature
  - Am an optimist
  - Prefer openness in all situations

- **Moral Management**
  - Communicate clear ethical standards for members
  - Set an example of ethical behavior in my decisions and actions
  - Set an example of dedication and self-sacrifice for the organization
  - Am fair and objective when evaluating member performance and providing rewards
  - Have concern for legal and organizational rules
  - Clarify who is responsible for what

- **Grounded leadership**
  - Am committed to lifelong learning
  - Am able to distinguish between compelling values
  - Am guided by principles rather than rules

- **Social responsibility leadership**
  - Show concern for others
  - Empower others with opportunities so that they develop their skills
  - Have a demeanor of humility
  - Encourage wellness and assistance programs
  - Encourage diversity practices
  - Contribute to campaigns and projects that promote the well-being of the society
  - Make investment to create a better life for future generations
  - Respects human rights beyond the legal requirements

- **Transformational leadership**
  - Show concern for sustainability issues
  - Emphasize the collective mission
  - Suggest different angles
  - Focus on strengths of employees
  - Am also responsible for society and the environment of my organization

- **Reverse items**
  - Do not believe that sustainability is a vital function for a good leader
  - Believe that only rules are not enough
  - Think that rewards and punishments are not useful in the long run
  - I assign tasks to employees based on my personal preferences
  - I like to be treated with the respect that I deserve based on my position
  - I am a pessimist

- **Social desirability scale**
  - I am always polite to people, even if they are not friendly
  - I have once taken advantage of someone
  - Sometimes I would rather take revenge than to forgive and forget
  - I sometimes feel infrigant if I do not get my way
  - I am a good listener, regardless of who I talk to
Next, we will discuss the development of the items for the different elements of ethical leadership.

**Developing Virtuous Ethical Leadership by Addressing Capacity for Ethical Competence**

For the BELS we use eight items to measure virtuous leadership. These items originate from the ELQ that fit best with Van Wart’s description of virtuous leadership including attributes like wisdom. In doing so, we selected the items relating to the moral person. These self-assessed items are “show strong concern for ethical and moral values,” “am honest and can be trusted to tell the truth,” “am fair and unbiased when assigning tasks to members,” “insist on doing what is fair and ethical even when it is not easy,” “acknowledge mistakes and take responsibility for them,” “regard honesty and Integrity as important personal values,” “oppose the use of unethical practices to increase performance,” and “hold members accountable for using ethical practices in their work”. The coefficients for these items vary from .68 to .72 in their validation study (Yukl et al., 2013).

In addition to these items we also include an item “exercise sound reasoning in deciding on the optimal course of action” relating to wisdom. This item is taken from the survey scale of Wang and Hackett (2016). Wisdom of a leader is a focal characteristic of a virtuous leader as portrayed by Van Wart (2014) but has not been used by Yukl and colleagues in the ELQ (Yukl et al. 2013) which we believe is a potential shortcoming. The coefficient of this item in the two studies conducted by Wang and Hackett (2016) had factor loadings of .78 and .87 respectively.

**Developing Authentic and Positive Ethical Leadership by Addressing Self Awareness**

To assess authentic leadership, we developed items using the description of Van Wart (2014). He classifies an authentic leader as a person who has a focus on her/his self-awareness and improvement. Most essentially as the label suggests, an authentic person displays her/his values through action and stays true to her/his words, hence the feature of “walking the talk” is among the key characteristic of such a leader besides the ability of controlling ego-drives. Therefore, we developed one item relating to the essential characteristic of authentic leaders “am aware of
my personal values” and imported two items from the ELQ scale “Keep my actions consistent with my stated values” and “Can be trusted to carry out promises and commitments.” These items had coefficient values of .75 and .72 respectively (Yukl et al., 2013).

Positive leaders are characterized by Van Wart (2014) as emphasizing openness, transparency, optimism, and resilience. We developed three items accordingly: “am resilient in nature,” “am an optimist,” and “prefer openness in all situations.”

**Developing Moral Management by Addressing Role Clarification**

Moral management is a dimension of the classical conceptualization of ethical leadership. It includes activities that are carried out by leaders to inculcate ethical values in their followers. These activities include two-way communication reinforcement and decision making (Brown et al., 2005). Although as explained earlier, empowerment is also highlighted among the activities of moral manager, on the basis of Van Wart's (2014) characterization we place empowerment within servant leadership below. Furthermore, based on the shortcomings discussed earlier, role clarification is added as a component of moral management. To assess the moral manager variety of ethical leadership, we use items from the ELQ scale: “communicate clear ethical standards for members,” “set an example of ethical behavior in my decisions and actions,” “set an example of dedication and self-sacrifice for the organization” and “am fair and objective when evaluating member performance and providing rewards.” These items had coefficients varying from .65 to .83 in the original validation study (Yukl et al., 2013).

Besides ELS and ELQ, the ELW also served as a popular scale for assessing ethical leadership. It is based on a construct that includes seven ethical leader behaviors, some of which, for instance role clarification and sustainability are lacking in both the ELS as well as ELQ (Kalshoven et al., 2011). Yukl et al. (2013 criticize the ELW based on arguments that some items use (1) multiple components (2) vague wording and (3) and mixing of positive and negative worded items. Although some of the leader behaviour that the ELW assesses, for instance sustainability, is related to other ethical leadership varieties, in the assessment of moral manager dimension, we include only one item relating to role clarification. This item “clarify who is responsible for what” had a coefficient of .75. Finally, we develop one item ourselves relating to rules: “have concern for legal and organizational rules.”
Developing Professionally Grounded Ethical Leadership by Addressing Ethical Competence (Learning) and Capacity for Self-Improvement

Professionally-grounded leadership considers broader ethical principles which are not part of the classical conceptualization as the moral management component of the classical conceptualization is more focused on rules and regulations. A focus on principles rather than rules through professionally grounded leadership gives the BELS a broader focus. To assess professionally grounded leadership, we make use of items that touch upon the fundamental differences between this variety and the values of moral manager. Due to lack of availability of a scale that measures professionally grounded leadership, we refer to the description by Van Wart (2014, p.29). He describes a grounded leader as someone who has the capacity to make reasonable exceptions to policies, the competence to deal with competing values and the ability to recognize inappropriate behaviour. These values, which can be developed by a leader through professional training, can be attributed to the learning component of leadership. By adding learning as a factor that differentiates professionally grounded leadership, we also address the shortcomings of the moral manager framework as propagated by Brown and colleagues (Brown et al., 2005), and the subsequent work based on this model. The item relating to learning was taken from Thun and Kelloway (2011). Besides the item “am committed to life-long learning” with a coefficient of .61, we incorporate a self-developed item relating “ability to distinguish between competing values” and “guided by principles rather than rules” based on the description by Van Wart (2014).

Developing Socially Responsible Ethical Leadership by Identifying Stakeholders, and Addressing Sustainability and Empowerment

Socially responsible leadership entails three sub styles: servant, spiritual leadership, and CSR. Servant leaders are described as persons who emphasize improvement in well-being, who believe in empowerment of employees and who have a characteristic of concomitant humility (Van Wart, 2014). To measure these characteristics, three items from the scale of Dennis and Bocarnea (2005) are used. These items “show concern for other,” “empower others with opportunities so that they develop their skills,” and “have a demeanor of humility” have coefficient values of .83, .80 and .82 respectively (Dennis & Bocarnea, 2005).
Spiritual leadership is characterized by the assumption of work as a calling and focus on wellness/assistance programs, diversity practices and bereavement programs (Van Wart, 2014). Spiritual leadership can be defined as “comprising the values, attitudes, and behaviors that are necessary to intrinsically motivate one’s self and others so that they have a sense of spiritual survival through calling and membership” (Fry, 2003, p.11). Literature also explains “Spiritual leadership can be viewed as a field of inquiry within the broader context of workplace spirituality. Both are areas of research in the early stage of development and therefore lack a strong body of theory and research findings” (Fry, 2003, p.108). In keeping consistency to our work, we uphold the attributes highlight by Van Wart (2014): care for others and diversity. We developed two items “encourage wellness and assistance programs” and “encourage diversity practices” to assess these tendencies (Van Wart, 2014).

Corporate social responsibility (CSR) is characterized by a focus on law abidance, legal and ethical responsibilities, sustainability, human rights and charity (Van Wart, 2014). To assess CSR, we use two items “contribute to campaigns and projects that promote the well-being of the society” and “make investment to create a better life for future generations” with coefficients of 0.67 and 0.81 from the scale of Turker (2009). We also develop an item relating to human rights, “respects human rights beyond the legal requirements” to fully cover the characterization of Van Wart (2014).

**Developing Transformational Ethical Leadership by Addressing “Withholding Necessary Transformation”**

To assess the transformational component of ethical leadership, we make use of a scale developed by Avolio et al. (1999). This instrument uses six factors to assess transformational leadership namely charisma/inspirational, intellectual stimulation, individualized consideration, contingent reward, management by exception-active and passive avoidant. Based on our understanding of negative tendencies of transactional tactics as explained earlier, we avoid using items relating this last factor. Instead we focus on Van Wart’s (2014) description of a transformational leader which is closely associated with sustainability of the environment. Since the scale by Avolio et al. (1999) does not assess this capacity, we incorporate an item relating to sustainability, “show concern for sustainability
issues” from the ethical leadership scale by Kalshoven et al., (2011) with a coefficient of .85. Beside sustainability, we incorporate three items from the scale by Avolio et al. (1999). These items are “emphasize the collective mission,” “suggests different angles,” and “focus on strength of employees.” They relate to the factors of charisma, intellectual stimulation and individualized consideration and have coefficients of .71(.77), .81(.79) and .82(.72) respectively for initial and replication set of samples. (Avolio et al., 1999).

**Table 1** shows the full survey tool, including sources of origin for each item. **Figure 5** shows all items incorporated in the BELS.

**Table 1: List of Items of BELS and Their Sources**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S No</th>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Source of items</th>
<th>Ethical Leadership Style</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>I, as leader</td>
<td>(ELQ) Yukl et al.</td>
<td>Virtuous Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Show strong concern for ethical and moral values</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Am honest and can be trusted to tell the truth</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Am fair and unbiased when assigning tasks to members</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Exercise sound reasoning in deciding on the optimal course of action</td>
<td>Wang and Hackett, 2016</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Insist on doing what is fair and ethical even when it is not easy</td>
<td>(ELQ) Yukl et al.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Acknowledge mistakes and take responsibility for them</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Regard honesty and integrity as important personal values</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Oppose the use of unethical practices to increase performance</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Hold members accountable for using ethical practices in their work</td>
<td>-</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Source of items denoting ‘*’ implies same as preceding.
<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Keep my actions consistent with my stated values</td>
<td>Van Wart, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Am aware of my personal values</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Can be trusted to carry out promises and commitments</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Am resilient in nature</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Am an optimist</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Prefer openness in all situations</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Communicate clear ethical standards for members (ELQ) Yukl et al. 2013</td>
<td>Moral Manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>Set an example of ethical behavior in my decisions and actions</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>Set an example of dedication and self-sacrifice for the organization</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>Am Fair and objective when evaluating member performance and providing rewards</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Have concern for legal and organizational rules</td>
<td>Van Wart, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>Clarify who is responsible for what (ELW) Kelshoven et al. 2011</td>
<td>Professionally grounded leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>Am committed to lifelong learning Thon and Kelloway, 2011</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>Am able to distinguish between competing values</td>
<td>Van Wart, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Am guided by principles rather than rules</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Show concern for others</td>
<td>Dennis and Bocarnea, 2005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Empower others with opportunities so that they develop their skills</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Have a demeanor of humility</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Encourage wellness and assistance programs</td>
<td>Van Wart, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Encourage diversity practices</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Contribute to campaigns and projects that promote the well-being of the society</td>
<td>Turk, 2009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Make investment to create a better life for future generations</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Respects human rights beyond the legal requirements</td>
<td>Van Wart, 2014</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Show concern for sustainability issues (ELW) Kelshoven et al. 2011</td>
<td>Transformational Leader</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Emphasize the collective mission (MLQ) Avolio et al. 1999</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Suggests different angles</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Focus on strength of employees</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Am also responsible for society and the environment of my organization</td>
<td>Added</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Do not believe that sustainability is a vital function for a good leader</td>
<td>Added, reverse of transformational L.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Believe that only rules are not enough</td>
<td>Added, reverse of moral manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Think that rewards and punishments are not useful in the long run</td>
<td>Added, reverse of moral manager</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>I assign tasks to employees based on my personal preferences</td>
<td>Reverse of 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.6 Conclusion

The goal of this article was to review and develop the literature of ethical leadership conceptualizations. The existing literature addressed multiple conceptualizations and made use of various measurement tools. To synthesize the literature, this study divided it into two broad schools of thoughts; classical and contemporary. By addressing the shortcomings of the classical conceptualization, we added the distinguishing elements of the contemporary conceptualization into this model to develop a broader conceptualization. In doing so, we offer a new definition that addresses these contemporary elements and a new ethical leadership survey scale which overcomes all existing limitations. We put forward our understanding of ethical leadership as: “Ethical leadership is the implicit and explicit pursuit of desired ethical behavior for self and followers through efforts governed by rules and principles that advocate learning motivation, healthy optimism and clarity of purpose to uphold the values of empowerment, service to others, concern for human rights, change for betterment and fulfilling duty towards society, future generations, environment and its sustainability.”

The Broader Ethical Leadership Scale (BELS) we proposed in this study is a comprehensive scale of ethical leadership that incorporates all elements of ethical leadership that have previously been only partially present within classical ethical leadership scales or in contemporary scales but not altogether. The BELS is an amalgam of items from existing scales and self-developed items where no existing scales were present. Existing scales were not used in full to avoid repetition. Most existing items were originally intended to be rated by subordinates, but we have changed these into first form by adding, ’I, as a leader’ before each item. To reduce the risk of social desirability or bias, we have incorporated a social desirability
scale and added a number of negatively coded items. Researchers who want to use the BELS can of course reformulate the items again to make them suitable for respondents’ rating their leaders.

Future research is needed to empirically validate the BELS and test whether the broader concept of ethical leadership holds. Some ethical attributes may be universal, for instance fairness and justice while others are more contemporary in nature. Some of the most distinguishable elements of the broader concept that pertain to modern day ethical debate are sustainability, openness to diversity, empowerment and care for society. The advocacy of these elements may also be subject to culture, geographical locations and organizational sector. With regard to empowerment of women, even in the most developed countries like the USA, women rights in numerous forms are yet to be fully implemented (Hester, 2012). Given that ethical leadership is normative in nature, we predict differences across cultures within some elements, but generic environmental concerns and human rights do not vary. We invite further research to determine which ethical leadership attributes stand universal and otherwise. Likewise, the feminine attribute of caring has been widely acknowledged (Noddings, 1984) and this aspect is put in contrast with relative psychological theories. Since the broader construct of ethical leadership entails such elements, it will be interesting to link care-associated attributes across gender in empirical studies, which could then indicate if female leaders outperform their male colleagues within this domain and if some attributes associate more closer to a specific gender as highlighted by Hester (2012). It is also important to further investigate the exploitation of women as “carers” (Kittay, 2003) and the misuse of “ethical leader’s care” in general by followers. Replication of existing studies using the BELS will also be interesting to test the broader concept of ethical leadership across different sectors i.e. public, private and nonprofit. It will be interesting to explore if ethical leadership has the same construct across these sectors or have multiple interpretations for these sectors as predicted (Heres & Lasthuizen, 2012).

Finally, the downside of proposed definition relates to its implicit focus on a number of important factors. However, our measurement scale, BELS, is longer than the existing scales and includes multiple items per dimension, which have been left as such because (a) a validation study can determine which items work best and (b) to obtain sufficient variation in responses. This is also in line with the study of
Ziegler et al. (2014) which suggests that before making a short measurement tool, a long measurement tool is needed. Alternatively, interviews could also prove to be an effective tool for ethical leadership (Heres and Lasthuizen, 2012). The BELS scale can provide a useful framework for such interviews.
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CHAPTER 5

Ethical leadership: Testing the broader conceptualization and measurement scale
5.1 Introduction

Recent scandals associated with moral lapses of leaders have stirred widespread discussions. Examples include the non-declaration of assets by a former Icelandic prime minister which led to his resignation after revelations in the Panama papers (Henley, 2016). Similarly, in the private sector, fraud and embezzlement by the former chairman of Hyundai Motors led to a jail sentence (Tharoor, 2010). Although such controversies are not new, they can have adverse effects. In the public sector, ethical issues can lead to a lack of trust among the general public in public institutions. It is for these reasons that ethical leadership has remained a topic of importance within academia (Shakeel et al., 2019).

However, the literature presents multiple conceptualizations of ethical leadership, such as the seminal construct by Brown and colleagues (2005) and subsequent work by Kalshoven (2011), Eisenbeiss (2012), Voegtlin (2016), and Van Wart (2014). Shakeel et al. (2020) divided these studies into classical and contemporary conceptualizations. The classical conceptualization pertains to studies that include and uphold the construct of Brown and colleagues (2005), which portrays ethical leadership as a set of attributes including the personal values of leaders and their efforts to instill these in followers. Contemporary conceptualizations refer to studies that include attributes such as empowerment, attention for diversity, attention for the capacity for leader learning, and care for the well-being of followers.

The multitude of conceptualizations has given rise to numerous measurement tools as well, such as the ethical leadership scale (ELS) by Brown et al. (2005), the ethical leadership at work (ELW) by Kalshoven (2011) and the ethical leadership questionnaire (ELQ) by Yukl et al. (2013). The difference in their focus mirrors the variance in approach outlined above. For example, the responsibilities of the leader have a narrower focus in the classical conceptualization than in the contemporary conceptualization. Classical conceptualizations stress the moral values of a leader and followers with some non-explicit emphasis on external stakeholders, whereas contemporary studies stress leaders’ attention for internal and external stakeholders with a particular focus on the wellbeing of employees, the environment and its sustainability. Critics of the classical conceptualization also highlight a number of other limitations that we will explain in the upcoming section.
The existence of different definitions and tools hinders generalization and replication of findings. It is important that a common ethical leadership conceptualization and scale are developed. That could also address the ambiguity between ethical leadership as a leadership style and related leadership styles. At the moment, the classical and contemporary conceptualizations present different answers to the question about the association between ethical leadership and other styles. Classical conceptualizations deem ethical leadership to be distinct from relating styles although, according to these studies, ethical leadership has links to styles like transformational and transactional leadership (Brown et al., 2005). Some contemporary studies maintain that numerous ethical leadership styles exist as varieties of other styles (Van Wart, 2014).

Shakeel et al. (2020) have proposed an integrated conceptualization and definition of ethical leadership. This conceptualization was based on the categorization of ethical leadership by Van Wart (2014). They systematically synthesized existing studies to include both the ideas of earlier classical as well as recent contemporary schools of thought. The integration of both schools of thought led to a broader conceptualization and definition, and a new integrated measurement tool, the broader ethical leadership scale (BELS). Subject to empirical testing, the study by Shakeel et al. (2020) will help in bringing forward a new conceptualization, definition and measurement tool of ethical leadership. This will also help in determining the link of ethical leadership and associated leadership styles.

The need for the broader ethical leadership scale (BELS) stem from the lack of a survey scale that covers a broader conceptualization. The existing scales were either based on the classical conceptualization, thus, predominantly based on a two-dimensional constructs or based on more contemporary studies and ignored some basic sub-values of classical conceptualization. Hence a scale that covers both the essentials of the classical conceptualization and contemporary values as well as reflecting the interconnectedness of the associated styles is missing. The broader ethical leadership scale (BELS) aims to address these missing links and provide a scale that is inclusive of all major sources of ethical values.

The goal of this study is to perform a first test of the broader ethical leadership scale which can be used to corroborate the conceptualization of Shakeel and colleagues (2020). This is achieved in a number of steps, creating the most
parsimonious measurement scale. In doing so it aims to find preliminary answers to three overarching questions; 1) Is ethical leadership broader than the construct put forward by Brown and colleagues (2005)? 2) Is ethical leadership a uni-dimensional or a multi-dimensional construct? 3) How does ethical leadership relate to other leadership styles? This test will help to determine whether ethical leadership should be studied from a broader lens (including more contemporary attributes) and it will aid in providing an authentic tool that can be used for replication purposes. In answering the third question, this study will also establish whether ethical components of various leadership styles are all dimensions of one style of ethical leadership as proposed by Van Wart (2014).

We first shortly review the literature on ethical leadership and discuss the development of the broader ethical leadership scale. The method section presents a brief introduction about the nature of our sample size, which was based in the public sector in the Netherlands (909 public servants in leadership positions) and elaborates our analytical approach which is carried out in four different steps. The article then proceeds to the results of the analysis. A discussion regarding the role of findings in theoretical development and considerations for a future research agenda will conclude the chapter.

5.2 Background

Conceptual development

Ethical leadership has been defined by Brown and colleagues as “the demonstration of normatively appropriate conduct through personal action and interpersonal relationships, and the promotion of such conduct to followers through two-way communication, reinforcement, and decision-making” (Brown et al., 2005, p.120). This definition implies two dimensions of ethical leadership: the moral person (referring to the personal qualities of the leader) and the moral manager (referring to the activities undertaken by leaders to guide followers towards ethical activities).

These dimensions were apparent in the definition provided and upheld by studies in the classical tradition. The researchers in this tradition viewed ethical leadership as a separate construct from relating other leadership styles, although they did not deny strong overlap. The contemporary studies identified new attributes stretching the responsibility of the leader from the limited role of managing the
self and followers’ ethics to taking into account the responsibility of stakeholders outside the organization such as external stakeholders, society and environment.

Critics of the classical school of thought highlight a number of limitations of the original construct. These limitations revolve around the incapacity to address a) a number of vital and contemporary leadership attributes such as leader learning and ethical competency, b) the lack of addressing stakeholders outside the organization, and c) the lack of establishing linkages to ethical components of related leadership styles. The link to other leadership styles, such as transformational leadership, has remained a puzzle avoided by classical and contemporary ethical leadership scholars alike. However, ethical leaders have been acknowledged to use multiple styles (Brown et al., 2005) depending upon the context of a situation (Heres and Lasthuizen, 2012).

A study by Shakeel and colleagues (2020, chapter 2 in this dissertation) presents an overview of the limitations of the classical conceptualization and proposes a broader conceptualization to overcome these problems. They present an integrated, broader conceptualization and associating scale, the Broader Ethical Leadership Scale (BELS). The BELS has increased the scope of ethical leadership using two core assumptions; that contemporary attributes form part of ethical leadership and that related leadership styles constitute an integral part of ethical leadership (cf. Van Wart 2014). Important contemporary attributes such as role clarification and sustainability were already identified as components of ethical leadership by some contemporary scholars (Kalshoven et al. 2011; Eisenbeiss 2012) but Van Wart’s (2014) claim that other styles are sub dimensions of ethical leadership has not yet been studied empirically.

The broader definition of ethical leadership is: “Ethical leadership is the implicit and explicit pursuit of desired ethical behavior for self and followers through efforts governed by rules and principles that advocate learning motivation, healthy optimism and clarity of purpose to uphold the values of empowerment, service to others, concern for human rights, change for betterment and fulfilling duty towards society, future generations, environment and its sustainability” (Shakeel et al., 2020, p.16). With this broader construct in mind, existing assessment scales measuring ethical leadership fell short of measuring key attributes of the new conceptualization. Hence a new survey tool encompassing all the newly added values was needed.
**Development of the BELS**

The BELS is an amalgam of items from numerous existing scales and some new ones that we developed ourselves, based on the literature. The items included in this scale are related to each of the numerous ethical leadership varieties listed by Van Wart (2014). These styles include virtuous, authentic, positive, moral manager, servant, spiritual, CSR and transformational leadership styles. Table 1 shows the ethical concerns of the various leadership styles and their focus on internal and/or external stakeholders, which have all been included in the broader conceptualization, and consequently in the BELS. Each of these styles is treated as a sub dimension of the broader concept of ethical leadership that is measured by the BELS. The original version of the BELS is included in the Appendix A. A more detailed description of the composition of the BELS follows below.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Leadership Style</th>
<th>Ethical Concerns (Van Wart, 2014)</th>
<th>External stake holders (Shakeel et al., 2019a)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Virtuous Leadership</td>
<td>Concern for Integrity</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Authentic Leadership</td>
<td>Concern for one's own values; to walk the talk</td>
<td>Internal only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positive Leadership</td>
<td>Concern for self-regulation leading to optimism</td>
<td>Internal only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral Management</td>
<td>Concern for legal and organizational rules</td>
<td>Internal only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professionally grounded Leadership</td>
<td>Concern for legal and organizational principles</td>
<td>Internal only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Servant Leadership</td>
<td>Concern for others</td>
<td>Internal and external</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spiritual Leadership</td>
<td>Concern for community</td>
<td>Internal and external</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>Concern for environment</td>
<td>Internal and external</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td>Concern for wholesome change</td>
<td>Internal and external</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 shows the description of each individual leadership style in terms of ethical concerns and the extent of organizational focus (Internal/external) of each style.
5.3 Method

Instrument

The BELS consists of 47 items pertaining to 9 ethical leadership sub dimensions. Most items were taken from existing scales: the ethical leadership questionnaire ELQ (Yukl et al., 2013), virtuous leadership scale (Wang and Hackett, 2016), servant leadership scale (Dennis and Bocarnea, 2005), and items measuring CSR, transformational and other leadership attributes (Avolio et al., 1999; Turker, 2009, Kalshoven et al., 2011). New items were developed to measure Spiritual leadership as there is no scale for this style yet. For example, the item “I as leader, support encourage bereavement programs” has been self-developed based on Van Wart (2014). Four negatively coded items based on the existing scales were added to counter respondent bias. All items were translated to the Dutch language by the two Dutch co-authors and then translated back by an independent scholar. This led to some minor editorial adjustments. Respondents were asked to which extent they agreed that the propositions fitted with their style as a leader, on a 5-point Likert scale. As a pilot study the questionnaire was tested for structure, clarity and wording by an expert panel of five leadership scholars. After discussing the results, some small amendments were made, leading to the final version of the measurement scale.

To check for bias relating to self-assessment, we also incorporated a social desirability scale (Hays et al., 1989). This is important because self-assessment surveys run the risk of self-favoring tendencies by respondents suffering from low self-esteem (Wells and Sweeney, 1986). Other items that inquired into demographic details included questions pertaining age, gender, sector, education and number of employees under the leadership of the respondent.

Sample

The data for this study were collected from public servants in a leadership position in The Netherlands using Flits panel. The BELS questionnaire was sent via a link by email between 25th May and 18th June, 2018 to 3645 public officials in leadership positions in all types of public organizations represented in the panel. After one reminder, it received a response of 25% by a total of 909 respondents. Of these respondents, 653 (71.8%) were male and 256 (28.2%) female respondents. This
distribution is representative of the population of public sector employees in a leadership position, as evidenced in the annual report on the Dutch national public service (Jaarrapportage Bedrijfsvoering Rijk, 2018). The respondents represented public officials working in education (30.1%), semi-autonomous government agencies (26.3%), the police force (9.6%), municipalities (12.5%), judiciary (0.8%), army (2.8%), water boards (3.5%), research institutions (4.7%), university medical centers (6.2%), provinces (2.5%) and regional government bodies (1.0%). Respondents varied in age (mean: 55, sd=7.39 range: 32-73 years) and background qualifications; most respondents had a higher education diploma (polytechnic 39%, university 28.3% and doctoral degree 13.8%) while the others mostly had technical educational diplomas. All respondents received a small report with descriptive findings, in return for their voluntary participation (which is the standard Flitspanel way of working).

**Analytical Procedure**

The analysis was carried out in four distinct steps. In the first step ‘Test of the proposed factor structure’, we determined the authenticity of the BELS scale as designed by Shakeel et al. (2020). To this end, we used confirmatory factor analysis. The associating model Figure 1 depicts this scheme using AMOS (version 25) SPSS package to determine model fit. This fit, however, did not yield the desired results. To check if and which attributes and dimensions of the broader conceptualization hold true, an exploratory factor analysis was needed. Therefore, in the second step ‘The new one factor model of ethical leadership’, we carried out an exploratory factor analysis in SPSS version 25. A parallel analysis test for Eigenvalues was used to determine the significant Eigenvalues, and a reliability analysis was used to determine the reliability of items from each factor, allowing us to drop redundant items and achieve a parsimonious end-result. The findings from this confirmatory analysis were retested in the third step, ‘Test of one factor model of ethical leadership’ using Model fit in AMOS. This led to a small improvement, reducing the number of items in the final scale to 33 instead of 35. Step 4 of the process discusses rooting out social desirability bias. We now turn to the results, followed by a discussion on their impact on theory development and an agenda for future research.
5.4 Step 1: Test of the proposed factor structure

Figure 1 shows the results of the AMOS analysis for the nine sub dimensions of ethical leadership: Virtuous, Positive, Authentic, Moral Manager, professionally grounded, spiritual, servant, CSR and Transformational leadership. The values depict a weak fit of the proposed model although there are multiple high factor loading for some items that represent contemporary factors. We believe that these results can be interpreted such that even though not all dimensions of ethical leadership are confirmed, there are sufficient elements that appear to be of significance, and which point to the existence of a broader concept than the original EL scales. This will be tested in the next step, but first we discuss the findings from step 1.

There are three measures to express the model fit values of the 9-dimensional ethical leadership construct. CMIN refers to the minimum discrepancy and according to literature its value should be closer to 1 and less than 3 for a good fit (Hu and Bentler, 1999 as cited in Gaskin, 2016). The 9-dimensional model yields a CMIN value (3.267) which does not indicate a good fit. We turn to the other indices, RMSEA and CFI. RMSEA shows the fit of the hypothesized model to a perfect model (Xia and Yang, 2018) and its value should lie below or be equal to 0.08 (Brown and Cudeck 1993) and less than .05 for a good fit (Xia and Yang, 2018). The value for our 9-dimensional model (.050) again does not show a good fit. PCLOSE is the p value of test on RMSEA (Hox and Bechger, 1998) and its desired value is greater than .05 (Hu and Bentler, 1999) whereas value for our model is (.507). The CFI shows the fit of the hypothesized model with baseline model (Xia and Yang, 2018, p. 409) and its acceptable value is greater or equal to .90 (Bagozzi and Yi (1988). Some researchers recommend a value greater than .95 for a better fit, however, deem value above .80 as permissible (Hu and Bentler, 1999 as cited in Gaskin, 2016). The 9-dimensional model has a CFI of (.756) which is not acceptable. In sum, the full 47-item BELS cannot be corroborated, but our next step will show that there is support for a smaller, more parsimonious version of the BELS.
Figure 1. The Broader ethical leadership conceptualization
5.5 Step 2: The new one factor model of ethical leadership

Given the bad model fit in step 1, we proceeded with an exploratory factor analysis (with no fixed factors) to investigate the factor structure of these items using SPSS, based on Eigenvalues and scree plots (see Figure 2). Although it was apparent from the Eigenvalues that a 11-factor solution was possible, the scree plots indicated that a 7-factor solution is more likely. We repeated the EFA multiple times keeping the number of fixed factors from 1 till 7. Table 2 shows the number of items, the nature of these factors and reliability scores for these solutions.

These analyses did however not reveal very strong individual factors. Three factors stood out. We labelled these factors as (1) overall moral values (which included mostly items pertaining to virtuous leadership), (2) a factor with items pertaining to principles and human rights, and (3) a factor consisting of items on sustainability. Table 2 illustrates the details of this factor analysis. These three factors had however small numbers of items and low reliability. Therefore, we decided that there was insufficient evidence for a multiple factorial solution and concluded that a one-factorial solution offers the strongest results. The total number of items of this one-factor solution was 43 when we began the analysis. Then we decided to suppress items with factor loading below 0.3, which led to a 35 items factors (reliability alpha=8.85). This overall high reliability could be caused by the high number of included items. Therefore, we decided to run a model fit for the 35 items using confirmatory factor Analysis (CFA), see step 3.

Based on the analysis so far, we can conclude that ethical leadership does include all the variables from the contemporary perspective that were identified by Shakeel and colleagues (2020). It also upholds the assumption that instead of a separate style of its own (as indicated by the classical studies), ethical leadership is a uni-dimensional construct. Ethical leadership can be explained as the sum of the ethical components of various leadership styles, as items pertaining to these multiple leadership styles are present in the one-factor construct of ethical leadership.
Figure 2. Scree plot

Figure 2 shows the scree plot resulting from exploratory factor analysis (Step 2).

Table 2. Factors and corresponding reliabilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No of Factors</th>
<th>Description of factors (no. of items)</th>
<th>Reliability per factor</th>
<th>Overall Reliability</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
<th>Item numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Overall moral values including contemporary</td>
<td>.852</td>
<td>8.52</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1,2,9,5,6,9,10,13,14,40,17,18,21,22,23,25,26,38,38,29,15,16,30,32,11,12,33,7,8,34,33,3,4,36,37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td><strong>Factor 1.</strong> Overall moral Values (33)</td>
<td><strong>Factor 1</strong> (.891)</td>
<td><strong>Factor 2</strong> (.015)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td><strong>Factor 1</strong> (1,2,19,5,6,9,10,13,14,40,17,18,21,22,23,25,26,38,38,29,15,16,30,32,11,12,7,8,34,33,3,4,36,37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Factor 2.</strong> Principles, sustainability and human rights (8)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Factor 2</strong> (20,39,41,24,31,33,43,34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td><strong>Factor 1.</strong> Overall moral Values(33)</td>
<td><strong>Factor 1</strong> (.891)</td>
<td><strong>Factor 2</strong> (-.083)</td>
<td>41</td>
<td><strong>Factor 1</strong> (1,2,19,5,6,9,10,13,14,40,17,18,21,22,23,25,26,38,38,29,15,16,30,32,11,12,7,8,34,33,3,4,36,37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Factor 2.</strong> Rules Principles and Campaign (6)</td>
<td><strong>Factor 2</strong> (.097)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Factor 2</strong> (20,39,41,24,31,33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Factor 3.</strong> Humility and Sustainability(2)</td>
<td><strong>Factor 3</strong> (.097)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Factor 3</strong> (43,34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No of Factors</td>
<td>Description of factors (no. of items)</td>
<td>Reliability per factor</td>
<td>Overall Reliability</td>
<td>Number of Items</td>
<td>Item numbers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td><strong>Factor 1.</strong> Overall moral Values(33)</td>
<td><strong>Factor 1</strong> (.891)</td>
<td>.854</td>
<td>42</td>
<td><strong>Factor 1</strong> (1,2,19,5,6,9,10,13,14,40,17,18,21,22,23,25,26,38,28,29,15,16,30,32,11,12,7,8,35,3,4,36,37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Factor 2.</strong> Rules Principles and Campaign (6)</td>
<td><strong>Factor 2</strong> (-.083)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Factor 2</strong> (20,39,41,24,31,33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Factor 3.</strong> Humility and Sustainability(2)</td>
<td><strong>Factor 3</strong> (.097)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Factor 3</strong> (43,34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Factor 4.</strong> Fairness (1)</td>
<td><strong>Factor 4</strong> (NA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Factor 4</strong> (42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td><strong>Factor 1.</strong> Overall moral Values(31)</td>
<td><strong>Factor 1</strong> (.891)</td>
<td>.852</td>
<td>43</td>
<td><strong>Factor 1</strong> (1,2,19,5,6,9,10,40,17,18,21,22,23,25,26,38,29,15,16,30,32,11,12,7,8,35,3,4,36,37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Factor 2.</strong> Rules Principles and Campaign (7)</td>
<td><strong>Factor 2</strong> (-.038)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Factor 2</strong> (20,39,41,24,31,33,43)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Factor 3.</strong> Sustainability (1)</td>
<td><strong>Factor 3</strong> (NA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Factor 3</strong> (34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Factor 4.</strong> Fairness (1)</td>
<td><strong>Factor 4</strong> (NA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Factor 4</strong> (42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Factor 5.</strong> Resilience, Optimism and Humility(3)</td>
<td><strong>Factor 5</strong> (.239)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Factor 5</strong> (13,14,27)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td><strong>Factor 1.</strong> Overall moral values(31)</td>
<td><strong>Factor 1</strong> (.891)</td>
<td>.852</td>
<td>43</td>
<td><strong>Factor 1</strong> (1,2,19,5,6,9,10,40,17,18,21,22,23,25,26,38,29,15,16,30,32,11,12,7,8,35,3,4,36,37)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Factor 2.</strong> Rules Principles and Campaign (6)</td>
<td><strong>Factor 2</strong> (-.083)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Factor 2</strong> (20,39,41,24,31,33)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Factor 3.</strong> Humility and Sustainability(2)</td>
<td><strong>Factor 3</strong> (.097)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Factor 3</strong> (43,34)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Factor 4.</strong> Fairness (1)</td>
<td><strong>Factor 4</strong> (NA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Factor 4</strong> (42)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Factor 5.</strong> Resilience and Optimism (2)</td>
<td><strong>Factor 5</strong> (.532)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Factor 5</strong> (13,14)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Factor 6.</strong> Humility(1)</td>
<td><strong>Factor 6</strong> (NA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Factor 6</strong> (27)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2 shows the result of exploratory factor analysis carried out in SPSS software. It shows the details of fixed number of factors (1-7) including the description of items, number of items in each factor, reliability per factor, overall reliability, total number of items in a given factor solutions and the item list per factor solution.

5.6 Step 3: Test of one factor model of ethical leadership

Next, we checked the model fit of the one factor model with 35 items using CFA in AMOS, see Figure 3. The value of loading for these items ranged from .66 to 1.11. We encountered two high cases of covariance between the error terms. These values were 66,900 between the error terms e8 and e9, and a value of 96,939 between the error terms e24 and e30. The error terms e8 and e9 correspond with the items ‘Am resilient in nature’ and ‘Am an optimist’. Although using a single factor model, we are able to covary any of these error terms, however, it is interesting to know that both these items represent a similar underlying theme which can be referred to as ‘positive leadership’. The error terms e24 and e30 corresponds to the items, ‘make investment to create a better life for future generations’ and ‘Show concern for sustainability issues’. A clear underlying theme behind these two items is ‘Sustainability’. We co-vary these error terms and Table 3 provides model fit values before and after co-varying.
The model fit for the uni-dimensional ethical leadership construct shows a strong and better fit than the 9-dimensional model. The RMSEA for the model fit is .044 which depicts a good fit and is lower than the desired .05 and the .049 result of the 9-dimensional model. The CMIN which ought to be closer to 1 (Hu and Bentler, 1999) is 2.760, which is also better than the 3.212 of the model we dismissed in step 1. Finally, the CFI of the one factor model is .849 and thus higher than the permissible (> .80) value according to Hu and Bentler (1999). These findings strengthen the results of the exploratory factor analysis in step 2.

To reach an even more parsimonious solution, we tested the effects of removing the co-varying items mentioned before, see Table 3 for results. A 33-item solution, taking out two covarying items, renders the best model fit values of all. The removed items are ‘Am an optimist’ (e9) and ‘Show concern for sustainability issues’ (e30). Although concern for sustainability is thus removed from the final scale, concern for the environment – which is an almost confounding idea – is represented through items 38 ‘Am also responsible for society and environment of my organization’ and item 32 ‘Make investments to create a better life for future generations’.

Compared to the reliability of the 35-item scale (Cronbach alpha .889), removal of the items 14 and 34 does not change the reliability of the scale (same alpha). Achieving a robust and parsimonious measurement instrument is of primary importance for this validation. So, while, sustainability is a vital attribute of ethical leadership, already identified by Kalshoven (2011), we feel that other items can cover it. “Sustainable development is a process of change in which the exploitation of resources, the direction of investments, the orientation of technological development, and institutional change are all in harmony and enhance both current and future potential to meet human needs and aspirations” (Wheeler and Beatley 2004, 57 as cited in Zeemering, 2009). Taking into account this definition, item 32 ‘Make investment to create a better life for future generations’ and item 38 ‘Am also responsible for society and the environment of my organization’ can together ensure that sustainability remains an integral component of the BELS. Hence, we opt for the 33-item scale as the best representation of the broader conceptualization of ethical leadership.
Table 3. Model fit Values

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Type</th>
<th>CMIN</th>
<th>CFI</th>
<th>RMSEA</th>
<th>PCLOSE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Covarying error terms (35 items)</strong></td>
<td>3.057</td>
<td>.823</td>
<td>.048</td>
<td>.937</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>One factor model after</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Covarying error terms (35 items)</strong></td>
<td>2.760</td>
<td>.849</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>34 item solution without e8</strong></td>
<td>3.031</td>
<td>.830</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.952</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>34 item solution without e9</strong></td>
<td>2.977</td>
<td>.835</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>34 item solution without e24</strong></td>
<td>2.946</td>
<td>.836</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>34 item solution without e30</strong></td>
<td>2.913</td>
<td>.840</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>33 item solution without e9 and e30</strong></td>
<td>2.812</td>
<td>.852</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.999</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3 shows the result of AMOS model fit Analysis. It shows the values of one factor solution (35 items), values without each of the two covarying items and without both covarying items (33 items). The scale with 33 items shows the best model fit.
Figure 3. One-factor construct of Ethical leadership

Figure 3 lists the total items (with identification numbers) resulting initially from the one factor solution (35 items).
5.7 STEP 4: Social desirability bias

The BELS included a social desirability scale (Hays et al., 1989). This was used to check for potential bias that could arise due to self-assessment of their leadership by the respondents. To check for social desirability bias, we check the model fitness for the items of the social desirability scale and correlate this with our current model to achieve a good fit. The correlation matrix between the unidimensional BELS and the social desirability scale is negative (-0.051), and not statistically significant. Thus, there is no evidence that results are confounded by social desirability bias.

5.8 Discussion

The testing of the BELS confirms the existence of an unidimensional scale of ethical leadership, instead of a multidimensional scale, and so we can conclude that the different elements of the broader conceptualization are highly integrated. The results from this study have multiple implications not only for our proposed model but also for our current understanding of ethical leadership. They indicate that the classical conceptualization of ethical leadership is indeed an incomplete model of ethical leadership. This confirms the limitations of the classical conceptualization as outlined by Shakeel et al. (2020). Empowerment, need for leader learning, and responsibility of the organization towards the environment are essential parts of ethical leadership.

In light of these results, we can now answer the three questions posed at the start of this study, before delving into an in-depth explanation of each component of the new definition. The first question concerned the scope of ethical leadership in relation to the classical conceptualization. Our findings suggest that the different elements can be theoretically distinguished but are empirically closely related, that is a leader who advocates ethical conduct within an organization is also more likely to advocate diversity, human rights and concern for environment. Hence, one element does not seem to occur without the other. This supports a broader conceptualization than presented in the classical approach. Furthermore, ethical leadership has been found to be a unidimensional construct, which answers the second question and puts at rest other theories including the two-dimensional classical conceptualization and the nine-dimensional vision of Van Wart’s (2014).
The findings from this study also provide an answer to the third question about the link between ethical leadership and other leadership styles. The inclusion of items representing all multiple leadership styles in the final one-factor model suggests that ethical leadership is an amalgam of ethical components of all associating leadership styles and not a separate style of its own. However more research is needed to further test and support this claim.

To structure the further discussion of our findings, we will use the different elements of the broader definition and then subsequently go into the relation of ethical leadership and associated leadership styles. The broader definition of the ethical leadership includes the following elements: “Ethical leadership is the implicit and explicit pursuit of desired ethical behavior for self and followers through efforts governed by rules and principles that advocate learning motivation, healthy optimism and clarity of purpose to uphold the values of empowerment, service to others, concern for human rights, change for betterment and fulfilling duty towards society, future generations, environment and its sustainability”.

**Care for the environment/stakeholders**

One of the most important shortcomings of the classical definition of ethical leadership related to the vagueness of the phrase: ‘demonstration of normatively appropriate conduct’. This warrants a two-point explanation for readers. It is true that on the one hand ethics are relative and tend to vary across cultural boundaries, and it could be for this very reason that this term is left vague for scholarship intentionally. However, on the other hand, normative appropriate conduct could also refer to the activities that have been developed over time within organizations and have become embedded within organizational culture. Although beneficial for the organization, such activities may not be good for stakeholders outside the organization. Studies relating to unethical pro-organizational behavior (Miao et al., 2013; Graham et al., 2015; Zhang, 2020) specifically discuss instances when commitment towards the own organization surpasses the ethical boundaries for concern of other societal and environmental factors. Such activities may still be part of a present ‘norm’, especially in the absence of laws that take into account environmental concerns.

The inclusion of numerous attributes of the broader conceptualization serves to put an end to this vagueness by highlighting the boundaries of concern for an
Ethical leader, which are not limited to the organization but also take external stakeholders into account. This clearly extends the responsibility of leader from previously ‘organizational focus’ to more broader concerns. All the items of the new scale that advocate concern for society and environment prove useful to establish this narrative. Associated items of the BELS are, ‘Am also responsible for society and the environment of my organization’ and ‘Oppose the use of unethical practices to increase performance’.

Numerous studies over time (e.g., Eisenbeiss, 2012; Den Hartog, 2015) have questioned the scope of the responsibility of an ethical leader. It has not been clear whether the role of an ethical leader is limited to her/his own organization or if that jurisdiction exceeds immediate environment. This study has now established and redefined the scope of ethical leadership. The responsibility of ethical leaders is not limited to the organization alone but outside the organization as well towards the society and the environment in which the organization operates. This responsibility is not time-bound but addresses the needs of future and upcoming generations as well.

Classical theories of ethical leadership have failed to identify external stakeholders as part of a leader's responsibilities. The studies by Eisenbeiss (2012), Kalshoven et al. (2011) and Voegtlin (2016) stand at contrast with the classical conceptualization in terms of attention for external stakeholders. The broader conceptualization makes it clear in concept and definition that the responsibilities of ethical leaders are not limited to the organization itself but also includes external stakeholders including the society in which the organization operates, and the environment. The associated item with this attribute is ‘Am also responsible for society and the environment of my organization’.

**Empowerment**

Now that we have established that ethical leaders are also responsible for activities outside the organization, it becomes vital to understand how the ethical leader operates within the organization. Classical conceptualizations defined ethical leaders as the sum of two main dimensions: the moral person and the moral manager. The moral person includes the virtues of the leader her/himself whereas the moral manager refers to the activities that ethical leaders undertake
to promote ethical behavior in their followers. These activities include role modeling, reinforcement and communication regarding ethics. Our results show that besides these, it is also important for an ethical leader to strongly advocate the empowerment of employees.

Although empowerment has been a point of discussion for scholars in the classical tradition, it has been missing in the definition put forward by Brown and colleagues (2005) and the survey scales associated with it. Later studies in the classical tradition already mention empowerment as an integral part of ethical leadership (Heres and Lasthuizen, 2012). Empowerment is part of the broader definition and included in the validated BELS scale through the item ‘Empower others with opportunities so that they develop their skills’.

**Learning motivation**

Ethical leadership studies, both classical and contemporary schools, have ignored the importance of learning for ethical leaders whereas some leadership studies attribute learning as one of the major functions of being a leader. According to Voegtlin (2016) it is an important part of leadership responsibility. This attribute has been associated with a professionally grounded leadership style. To be able to choose between competing values and tackling ethical dilemmas, leaders need expert skills. While experience can be of good help, to keep track of changes in this fast-paced environment learning becomes important not just for followers but more so for leaders to learn and apprise followers of the information needed to perform their jobs more effectively. Learning by leaders was assessed using one item in BELS: ‘Am committed to lifelong learning’.

**Role clarification**

Some contemporary studies of ethical leadership identified and addressed role clarification as part of ethical leadership (De Hoogh and Den Hartog, 2008; Kalshoven et al., 2011). Our study has shown that role clarification (in terms of expectation of leaders from followers relating outcomes) is an integral component of ethical leadership. However, we believe that there can be two possible interpretations/components of role clarification, which Shakeel et al. (2020) failed to distinguish in their original proposition. These include (1) communication or
expectations of ethical standards from followers and (2) expectation in terms of output or performance. Although Shakeel et al. criticized the classical studies for ignoring this aspect, we believe that the classical studies do partly address the concerns in terms of communication of ethical standards. However, both views have been represented in two distinct items. These items are ‘Communicate clear ethical standards for members’ and ‘Clarify who is responsible for what’.

**Concern for employees**

The classical understanding of ethical leaders was based on a moral manager who strategized and managed ethical values in followers. However, our results show that the relationship of ethical leaders and followers is not transactional but based on concern. Ethical leaders are identified as individuals who focus on the strength of employees, show concern for others, and promote wellness, assistance and bereavement programs for staff and followers. Such behavior marks a shift from the role of traditional leader towards a role which is similar to mentorship and coach. Items associated with such behavior include ‘Show concern for others’ and ‘Encourage wellness and assistance programs’.

Rewards and punishment to generate needed behavior of employees and in return favorable outcomes represent a transactional style of leadership and are an important component of the classical conceptualization of ethical leadership, both in the definition and the survey scales based on it. However, such a mode of disciplining employees can be unhealthy (Covin et al., 1992; Pierce and Gardner, 2004). Our study does not support either point of view; the item ‘Think that rewards and punishments are not useful in the long run’ was not included in the final scale. Based on these findings, it is however not immediately clear whether rewards and punishments are used or considered useful in the short term, and therefore part of the ethical leader’s repertoire. That would require more research.

**Link to other leadership styles**

Several studies in the literature have predicted a link between ethical leadership and relating leadership roles (Treviño et al., 2003; Brown et al. 2005; Van Wart, 2014). Besides the earlier studies of Treviño et al. (2003) and Brown et al. (2005) who initially proposed and acknowledged the links between ethical leadership and
related leadership styles, contemporary studies by Van Wart (2014) and Shakeel et al. (2020) strongly advocated for ethical leadership to imbibe these styles (cf. Table 1). Our results show that ethical leaders imbibe servant, positive, professionally grounded, CSR and transformational leadership styles. We briefly discuss each of these individual component styles below.

**Virtuous leadership**

All elements of virtuous leadership (moral person and moral manager) are included in the BELS. This shows the importance of virtuous leadership as a fundamental component of ethical leadership, both in the classical and broader conceptualizations.

Following our broader conceptualization, we added an item about wisdom, as part of virtuous leadership: ‘Exercise sound reasoning in deciding on the optimal course of action’. This was inspired by Van Wart (2014). The analysis confirmed the importance of this item. Wisdom may however also be linked to ethical competency and professionally grounded leadership. More research is therefore needed to disentangle this.

**Positive leadership**

Positive leadership is represented with three distinct attributes including resilience, optimism and transparency. All these attributes play a vital role in ethical leadership. Resilience for instance is the ability to bounce back from adversity (Hartley, 2018, p.211) which is relevant to ethical dilemmas or ability of leader to help recover an organization from an ethical lapse. Two items on positive leadership are included in the BELS: ‘Am resilient in nature’ and ‘Prefer openness in all situations’. The item on optimism was eliminated because of covariation and the need to reach a parsimonious scale.

**Spiritual Leadership**

Spiritual leadership is characterized by attributes relating to the welfare of employees and diversity. As ethical leadership is expected to result in positive organizational changes including higher motivation of employees and ethical
leaders are expected to be an advocate against discriminatory policies, these attributes are important to the broader conceptualization. All three items related to this style have been included in the final BELS: ‘Encourage wellness and assistance programs’, ‘Encourage diversity practices’, and ‘Encourage bereavement programs’. These items are in line with the concern for others that was discussed above, and signal a switch of responsibility for ethical leaders from a more managing style (as propagated in the classical studies) towards more serving behavior. Diversity, which remained a key critique on earlier studies, has now also become part of ethical leadership.

Servant Leadership
Servant leadership is represented by three items in the BELS. Only two items were included, but these are among the most important attributes according to both classical and contemporary authors. These items include ‘Show concern for others’ and ‘Empower others with opportunities so that they develop their skills’. Survey scales based on classical studies also included an item ‘giving voice to employees’ which makes for a plausible connection with servant leadership but was never part of the classical definition.

CSR
Out of the three items associated with CSR, two items were included in the BELS: ‘Make investment to create a better life for future generations’ and ‘Respects human rights beyond the legal requirements’. The inclusion of an item pertaining to human rights will make the BELS the only ethical leadership scale that considers human rights as an assessment criterion for ethical leaders. The item about concern for future generations transcends the responsibility of ethical leader to a wider degree than previously considered and fits with the boundary transcending definition of the broader conceptualization.

Professionally grounded
Out of the three items originally made part of BELS as representing grounded leadership, two items were included: ‘Am committed to lifelong learning’ and ‘Am able to distinguish between competing values’. A connection with grounded leadership
helps to broaden the view of ethical leadership by introducing ethical competency which we believe is the product of learning, as discussed above.

**Transformational leadership**

Classical studies of ethical leadership have already speculated on the interlinkages of transformational and ethical leadership. Shakeel and colleagues incorporated 6 items (positively worded) relating to transformational leadership in the BELS. Four of these have been included after the analysis, which confirms the presence and linkages of transformational leadership as a vital part of broader ethical leadership construct. These items are: ‘Emphasize the collective mission’, ‘Suggest different angles’, ‘Focus on strength of employees’ and ‘Am also responsible for society and the environment of my organization’.

Other items in the BELS connect to characteristics of transformational leadership such as the tendency to prefer openness in all situations and acknowledging and taking responsibility for mistakes and acquiring attributes that can be learned such as the ability to choose between competing values. This shows the competency of the ethical (transformational) leader to steer out of complex ethical dilemmas.

**5.9 Conclusion**

This study aimed to test the BELS. The results achieved are the first and by no means conclusive steps towards achieving a validated scale. More research and replications are necessary, but the results show that the BELS can help to bridge the gap between classical and contemporary studies. This offers new insights to the existing literature on ethical leadership.

Our results suggest that the ethical leadership contains more sub-values than in the seminal definition. This study has therefore corroborated our broader definition of ethical leadership: “Ethical leadership is the implicit and explicit pursuit of desired ethical behavior for self and followers through efforts governed by rules and principles that advocate learning motivation, healthy optimism and clarity of purpose to uphold the values of empowerment, service to others, concern for human rights, change for betterment and fulfilling duty towards society, future generations, environment and its sustainability”(Shakeel et al., 2020, p.16).
This study performed the first steps in validating the ethical leadership measurement scale (BELS). Using exploratory factor analysis and AMOS, we found that the one-factor solution with 33 items fitted best. The resultant ethical leadership scale is a comprehensive and parsimonious tool to assess ethical leadership. It includes all contemporary attributes that were identified as lacking in earlier classical conceptualizations and scales, such as empowerment, leader learning, concern for others, but also diversity and advocacy for human rights. Our study has also established links between ethical leadership and other leadership styles, including virtuous, positive, professionally grounded, servant, spiritual, CSR, and transformational leadership. These styles are part of the new construct, which indicates that ethical leadership is not separate from other leadership styles but is in fact an amalgam of ethical components of associated leadership styles.

5.10 Limitations and recommendations for future research

This study has a few limitations that merit attention. The foremost limitation is the lack of a comprehensive pilot study to assess the tool, although we did make use of expert panel to provide feedback on editorial points and check the structure of items when they were translated to the Dutch language and translated back in English. Other possible limitations include a focus on the public sector and the fact that the findings are limited to one country. The final version of the BELS is an extensive tool that uses 33 items. Some items could perhaps be more relevant to a particular sector than another sector. We used a self-assessment scale and while there are no indications of social desirability bias, it is important that future studies also focus on follower assessment of their leaders. Future researchers can focus on further improving the definition of ethical leadership as the present definition might have been built around only positively valence themes (Alvesson & Einola, 2019; Hughes, Lee, Tian, Newman, & Legood, 2018; Sidani & Rowe, 2018).

This study made use of same dataset to perform CFA, EFA and repeated CFA. Although it may have not provided stronger grounds since it runs the risk of capitalization on chance but presently serves as a good point of direction for future research studies and to progress academic dialogue. Upcoming studies can overcome these limitations by aiming for distinct and independent samples or splitting sample at the least. Predictive studies and testing nomological networks can also be used to achieve a more robust scale.
We invite scholars to replicate the BELS, preferably in different sectors, countries and cultures. It should also be adapted to other languages to verify its authenticity.
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1 Flits panel is a panel hosted by Internetspiegel on behalf of the Dutch Home Office (see https://www.flitspanel.nl/). Researchers can buy into the panel to put items or full questionnaires to samples of civil servants and public sector workers at national level.
CHAPTER 6

Conclusion
The aim of this dissertation is to further develop the construct of ethical leadership. To achieve this objective, I conducted three theoretical studies and one empirical study. Based on these studies, sub-research questions pertaining to the conceptualization, definition and measurement of ethical leadership were answered. Multiple theoretical studies helped define and bring forth a new, broader conceptualization of ethical leadership—defined as “the implicit and explicit pursuit of desired ethical behaviour for self and followers through efforts governed by rules and principles that advocate learning motivation, healthy optimism and clarity of purpose to uphold the values of empowerment, service to others, concern for human rights, change for betterment and fulfilling duty towards society, future generations, environment and its sustainability” (Shakeel et al., 2020a, p.10)—and a new measurement tool called the Broader Ethical Leadership Scale (BELS). In contrast to existing conceptualizations and measurement scale, this dissertation offers a broader narrative that addresses existing limitations and adds new perspectives to the literature on ethical leadership. In doing so, it clarifies ambiguities regarding the relationship between ethical leadership and other, associated leadership styles.

In this chapter, I first present the summarized insights of the four studies and highlight the main findings of each chapter. Next, I answer the sub-research questions raised in the introduction and the main research question. I explain how these answers contribute to the existing literature and societal dialogue. Further, I discuss the implications of the new, broader conceptualization and measurement scale for the existing understanding. Finally, I discuss the limitations of the studies, which leads to a number of recommendations for academics and practitioners.

6.1 Summary

Chapter 1

Chapter 1 explains the importance of studying ethical leadership and illustrates the gaps in the current literature through a three-tier model. Research questions and sub-questions are proposed to address these gaps. The three-tier model put forward in Chapter 1 depicts three types of ethical values: basic, normative and evolving values. The literature discussing leadership styles examines these types of values separately but does not consider a broader scope that can cover mul-
multiple tiers in one definition or concept. The broader conceptualization presented in this dissertation offers an ethical leadership narrative that covers the broadest scope of all existing leadership theories. I discuss this scope and multiple associated leadership theories in the upcoming sub-sections based on the findings from the studies included in this dissertation. The three-tier model illustrates the difference between the previous conceptualizations of ethical leadership and the additions (resulting from this dissertation) as a contribution to our current understanding of this type of leadership. I use this three-tier model in the discussion section to further clarify the ideas and findings of this dissertation pertaining to ethical leadership.

Chapter 2
Chapter 2 (published as Shakeel et al., 2019a) provides a structured literature review on ethical leadership. The review identifies recurring themes within the literature on the conceptualization, research practices and findings related to ethical leadership. Chapter 2 considers four such themes: definitions, measurement instruments, public sector studies and negative aspects of ethical leadership. The first two themes are important for this chapter, as they provide direct input for the development of a new definition and conceptualization. The discussion section describes all four themes and their role in the understanding of ethical leadership.

The findings from this study reveal that there is no single popular definition of ethical leadership, as multiple conceptualizations of ethical leadership are currently present in the literature. The definition proposed by Brown and colleagues (2005), however, has been cited frequently, and I often refer to it as the seminal conceptualization. Brown and colleagues (2005) define ethical leadership as “the demonstration of normatively appropriate conduct through personal action and interpersonal relationships, and the promotion of such conduct to followers through two-way communication, reinforcement, and decision-making” (Brown et al., 2005, p.120). This definition provides a two-dimensional (moral person and moral manager) construct of ethical leadership used in several seminal studies (Treviño et al., 2003; Treviño et al., 2000).
Hence, due to the presence of multiple understandings, the literature reports no conclusive conceptualization of ethical leadership. Similarly, there is not one single popular measurement tool used to measure ethical leadership. Researchers use at least three multiple ethical leadership scales, including the Ethical Leadership Scale (ELS) (Brown et al., 2005), the Ethical Leadership at Work (ELW) questionnaire (Kalshoven et al., 2011) and the Ethical Leadership Questionnaire (ELQ) (Yukl et al., 2013).

In conclusion, there are literature gaps caused by the lack of common conceptualizations and measurement scales of ethical leadership. Some related studies have been conducted in the public sector; however, more empirical work is needed to establish conclusions. An overemphasis on ethics can also be problematic, which calls for ethical leadership to be a part of strategic planning. There is also a growing need to establish associations between various leadership styles that play a role in ethical leadership.

Chapter 3

Chapter 3 (published as Shakeel et al., 2019b) provides a number of theoretical propositions regarding ethical leadership functions based on an understanding developed from the literature. This study proposes that ethical leadership should be studied through a processual lens to understand the associations between the numerous roles of ethical leadership components. It offers four illustrative propositions: the ethical leadership timeline, ethical leadership concentric circles and steps, and ethical leadership quadrants. The insights from this chapter help solve the puzzle regarding the relationship between ethical leadership and other leadership styles. This explanation supports the examination of the different levels of the three-tier model as a coherent whole.

The ethical leadership timeline presents ethical leadership on a continuum of external orientation. The left-hand side of the continuum includes virtuous leadership, where leaders have little to no external orientation and focus entirely on self-development (ethics). The right-hand side of the continuum includes transformational leadership, where leaders have the strongest external orientation and focus entirely on the implementation of change to adapt to external circumstances.
The ethical leadership process shows six distinct virtues that represent six different moral milestones that a leader can complete to attain a certain level of external orientation. The distinct group of virtues associated with the six steps corresponds to different leadership styles. These steps help a leader start developing his/her external orientation from the first stage of no external orientation (internal virtuous leader) towards the sixth stage to become fully externally oriented and capable of implementing ethical mandates (transformational leader). Each subsequent step entails a set of ethical behaviours that depict a broader external orientation (in terms of responsibility), which leaders can achieve by developing from being self-focused to working with others in implementing change.

The ethical leadership concentric circles include virtuous leadership at the centre, indicating that all outer circles (different styles) include virtuous leadership as a central component. In the immediate outer layer, but not the outer circles, positive leadership includes virtuous leadership as an essential component. Transformational leadership is the outermost circle, and hence, all circles inside it are part of transformational leadership. This can be interpreted to mean that all transformational leaders are virtuous leaders but not vice versa.

The fourth illustration relates to the quadrants of ethical leadership, showing leadership styles across two dimensions: ethics and external orientation.

The underlying assumption behind these multiple approaches presented in Chapter 3 remains the identification of similar and dissimilar aspects of various leadership styles. The external orientation of leaders is presented as a possible bridge between multiple leadership styles. On the one hand, each of these theories shares ethical components that help establish their linkages with each other, and on the other hand, the scope of leader responsibilities (external orientation) is a possible distinctive feature of each leadership style. Hence, these multiple styles can be seen as a function of a similar broader process: ethical leadership. These assumptions are also in line with the ethical leadership varieties as categorized by Van Wart (2014). These assumptions are instrumental in our understanding of ethical leadership, which, through a processual lens, contributes to the construction of a broader scope than the scope adopted in seminal studies of ethical leadership.
Hence, ethical leadership is found to be an amalgam of ethical components of associated leadership styles, namely, virtuous, positive, transactional, moral manager, professionally grounded, spiritual, CSR, servant and transformational leadership styles. The main distinction between these roles is the jurisdiction of ethical leaders’ responsibility, which is referred to as the external orientation of leaders.

Chapter 4
The previous chapter carries an underlying assumption that ethical leadership is broader than the seminal construct. Hence, Chapter 4 (published as Shakeel et al., 2020a) explains the associations between numerous leadership styles. It posits that these leadership styles differ in their focus on externalities and that each leadership style includes an ethical side and a corresponding unethical darker side. In Chapter 4, this assumption is carried forward by establishing the missing components of the seminal construct in light of a possible broader conceptualization. Chapter 4 builds a new definition of ethical leadership that is in line with the broader narrative. It starts by listing a number of limitations from the seminal conceptualization by Brown and colleagues (2005). These limitations include a focus on negative reinforcement (which is argued to be harmful), ambiguity in normative appropriateness, a lack of identification of stakeholders, a lack of empowerment, and a lack of focus on role clarification and leader learning. These limitations include both new limitations and those identified in the literature (Den Hartog, 2015). Keeping in mind these limitations of the seminal conceptualization of ethical leadership (Treviño et al., 2000; Treviño et al., 2003; Brown et al., 2005), the chapter offers a new, broader conceptualization of ethical leadership. This conceptualization is achieved through the synthesis of existing literature and is in line with the categorization of ethical leadership styles by Van Wart (2014). The new definition of ethical leadership overcomes existing limitations and is defined as “the implicit and explicit pursuit of desired ethical behaviour for self and followers through efforts governed by rules and principles that advocate learning motivation, healthy optimism and clarity of purpose to uphold the values of empowerment, service to others, concern for human rights, change for betterment and fulfilling duty towards society, future generations, environment and its sustainability” (Shakeel et al., 2020a, p.10).
To better understand the scope of the difference between the two definitions, it is important to illustrate the similarities and differences in their scopes. This can be achieved by linking them to the three-tier value model. Values pertaining to the seminal construct can be linked to the first level of the three-tier model, which represents basic ethical values, whereas values pertaining to the broader definition can be linked to the first and third levels of the model, which represent basic and evolving values. Hence, the broader definitions assimilate the values in the seminal definition (basic values) and evolving values, and it thus delivers on a larger ethical mandate.

In addition to presenting a broader narrative and definition, this chapter introduces the Broader Ethical Leadership Scale (BELS) for empirical testing. This scale comprises newly created items and items from existing scales. As discussed above, the broader conceptualization is seen as an amalgam of ethical values of multiple leadership styles. To incorporate these values in a measurement scale, items were adopted from multiple existing leadership scales. The presence of imported items presented a risk of overlapping and overrepresentation of values (similar values represented multiple times through different items). This risk further increased due to the presence of multiple constructs of each leadership theory. To avoid this inherent risk of overrepresentation and repetition, the description by Van Wart (2014) was followed to achieve consistency. The final scale at this point included 37 items with an additional six reverse-coded items and five items adopted from the Social Desirability Scale (Hays et al., 1989). These items were designed to be assessed using a Likert scale.

In conclusion, Chapter 4 synthesizes existing conceptualizations of ethical leadership to deliver a new, broader conceptualization that overcomes a number of limitations of the seminal construct. It also provides a new survey measurement scale that is in line with the broader concept and requires empirical validation.

**Chapter 5**

Based on the call for studies in the public sector (Chapter 2) and the need for the testing of the BELS (Chapter 4), Chapter 5 (Shakeel et al., 2020) presents an empirical test of the broader ethical leadership conceptualization and measurement scale using data from a sample of 909 public officials based in
the Netherlands. The multi-dimensional conceptualization was first tested using all 43 items, including the negatively coded items, using AMOS. However, the model fit indices did not yield the desired result for a multi-dimensional construct. Hence, an exploratory factor analysis was carried out to determine the factor configuration. This analysis resulted in a one-factor solution for the ethical leadership construct. This one-factor structure was retested with model fit indices using AMOS. Based on this analysis, I decided to remove a number of items with low coefficient loadings. This led to a lower number of items (35), and after two co-varying items were removed, an even better fit was achieved for the one-factor model. This test supports a broader nature of ethical leadership and the new definition presented in Chapter 5. The final version of the BELS includes 33 items that represent ethical components from the seminal model, but also items for other leadership styles: virtuous, positive, professionally grounded, spiritual, servant, transformational leadership and CSR. These findings are detailed in the upcoming discussion and portray a broader narrative of ethical leadership that encompasses leader behaviour ranging from focusing on self-ethics to including other stakeholders both inside and outside the organization.

In conclusion, Chapter 5 rejects the limited multi-dimensional seminal conceptualization of ethical leadership (basic values) and suggests a possible broader conceptualization that covers a broader ethical mandate (basic values and evolving values). It presents an ethical leadership measurement scale that assesses leaders on broader ethical values than existing scales do. Further testing is necessary for full validation, and recommendations to that end have been included in Chapter 5.

6.2 Answers to the research questions
Based on the insights from the studies discussed above, I now address the sub-research questions posed in Chapter 1: How can ethical leadership be (1) defined, (2) conceptualized and (3) measured?

6.2.1 Definition of ethical leadership
In the first chapter, I outlined the gaps in the literature by illustrating a three-tier model. Subsequently, in Chapter 2, I reported findings from the literature pertaining to the presence of multiple conceptualizations. These findings led
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to Chapter 3, where, based on a number of limitations, I provided a broader conceptualization that was achieved through synthesis of the existing constructs and based on the categorization of Van Wart (2014). Unlike the seminal definition, which includes only values linked to level 1 (basic values) of the three-tier model, the broader definition includes values linked to both level 1 (basic values) and level 3 (evolving values).

Based on the broader ethical leadership conceptualization developed in this dissertation, ethical leadership can be defined as “the implicit and explicit pursuit of desired ethical behavior for self and followers through efforts governed by rules and principles that advocate learning motivation, healthy optimism and clarity of purpose to uphold the values of empowerment, service to others, concern for human rights, change for betterment and fulfilling duty towards society, future generations, environment and its sustainability” (Shakeel et al., 2020a, p.10). The broader ethical leadership definition overcomes the multiple limitations associated with the seminal construct, including the removal of negative reinforcement, the identification of all stakeholders, and a special focus on empowerment, the external environment and leader learning. In addition to the limitations outlined earlier, new values pertaining to optimism, resilience, and a focus on diversity and human rights were found to be an integral part of the ethical leadership conceptualization. In Chapter 1, I presented a three-tier model that illustrated basic moral values, normative (cultural) values and evolving values. I argued that the seminal construct covered only one of the three levels of this model, i.e., basic moral values and their propagation. It lacked a focus on the remaining two levels of the model: normative and evolving values. The broader conceptualization of ethical leadership developed and verified in this dissertation now covers at least two levels of the three-tier ethical values model, as it embeds sub-values that pertain to basic moral values (similar to moral person and virtuous leadership) as well as evolving values that have not been previously discussed as part of the ethical leadership construct.

6.2.2 Conceptualization of ethical leadership

The broader definition distinguishes between the multiple values and the promotional activities that can be undertaken to promote these values (explained further in the discussion section). The seminal construct covered one level of the
three-tier model discussed in Chapter 1, whereas the broader conceptualization covers two levels of this model and can be adapted to cultural settings to include items that are normatively appropriate; it can then possibly cover all three levels of the model. The broader conceptualization addresses the limitations of existing studies by bringing together values that were previously part of either one construct or another; moreover, it covers values that were not previously part of any ethical leadership construct, such as diversity, human rights, resilience, healthy optimism and leader learning. The empirical validation of Chapter 5 proves consistency in the conceptualization developed throughout the first four chapters, which makes the conceptualization more than a random amalgam.

The broader conceptualization is also in line with the processual aspect of ethical leadership, as both of these viewpoints posit that associated leadership styles not only share limited activities of ethical leadership but are integral components of ethical leadership conceptualizations. This association between ethical leadership and other leadership styles has remained an open question in the literature. Previously, these styles were considered to play some role, but they were not yet understood to be distinct from ethical leadership. However, that narrative now has limitations. In light of the testing results of the BELS, it seems warranted to assume that ethical leadership is in fact an amalgam of ethical components of these multiple leadership styles with a corresponding unethical darker side of each leadership style. The seminal construct (best understood as moral manager) is one facet of the many forms of ethical leadership varieties (Van Wart, 2014). The broader ethical leadership conceptualization encompasses also elements of virtuous, authentic, positive, transactional, moral manager, professionally grounded, socially responsible and transformational leadership styles.

6.2.3 Measurement of ethical leadership scale
Empirical studies have measured ethical leadership using various measurement scales, including the ELS, the ELW, and the ELQ, which have been adapted for use in other languages. Some of these scales are based on the seminal construct and have greatly helped shape the academic dialogue of ethical leadership. However, evidence suggests that ethical leadership has more attributes than are currently assessed by available measurement scales. The ELS and ELW are based on seminal studies and, as per relevant theory, are limited to ethical leadership
as the sum of the moral person and the moral manager. They essentially omit the more contemporary values that are part of the ethical leadership construct, such as the sub-values of diversity, human rights, care for the environment and compassion towards followers. The ELW is based on a grounded study within the Dutch population, and unlike the ELS and ELQ, it incorporates some essential contemporary values, including environmental sustainability and a people orientation. However, it still lacks numerous other contemporary sub-values that pertain to the importance of ethical principles, adherence to human rights, optimism and resilience. In addition, in all of the above-mentioned scales, one aspect is their length. Some questionnaires were developed to simplify and shorten the number of items from previous questionnaires; for example, the ELQ was developed, among other reasons, to shorten the ELS (on which it is based) for ease of use (Yukl et al., 2013).

The BELS stands out as a tested instrument that includes not only items on basic integrity but also items on contemporary values. Studies using the BELS could provide interesting insights relating to ethical leadership effects and antecedents. The BELS is an extensive scale that represents not only the broader conceptualization presented in this dissertation (Shakeel et al., 2020) but also other ethical leadership conceptualizations that include evolving values (Eisenbeiss, 2012; Voegtlin, 2016). This makes it an important tool for researchers to replicate, hoping to corroborate findings from my research and studies that employed scales based on seminal studies. The BELS, like other ethical leadership scales, uses leaders’ self-assessment, which can lead to biased evaluations. This issue can be addressed by redesigning the BELS to include assessments by subordinates of leaders as well. The BELS can be further developed and validated by testing it in other countries and in cross-sectional studies.

6.3 Discussion

To discuss the viability of the broader ethical leadership conceptualization, we return to the three-tier model to bring more clarity regarding the multiple types of values, their association with leadership styles and prescribed promotional activities. A discussion on separating values from promotional virtues is also crucial to ascertain the contribution of this dissertation to existing studies. We first discuss the positioning of multiple values across the multiple levels of the three-
tier model and then discuss the placement of different leadership styles within this model. In the end, we mark the progress achieved by this dissertation by distinguishing values from promotional activities and comparing the new findings to the existing literature.

The seminal construct of ethical leadership includes two broad dimensions: ‘the moral person’ and ‘the moral manager’ (Treviño et al., 2000; Treviño et al., 2003; Brown et al., 2005). The moral person refers to the sub-value of integrity and associated virtues, including fairness, honesty, justice, and prudence (rationality). These values pertain to the first level of the three-tier model pyramid, where such basic values reside. The second dimension of this seminal model refers to the moral manager, related to the promotion and management of these values among followers. Since the values promoted are the same basic virtues discussed earlier, we place them both in the first level of the three-tier model. In the introduction to this dissertation, we thus started with a three-tier model with only the bottom first tier shown in green to mark the presence of seminal values in the model.

The second tier refers to the cultural and traditional values that are related to and rooted in cultural or religious contexts and is hence context dependent in nature. Since we focus on developing ethical leadership theory, a discussion on normative leadership aspects of multiple cultures and places is beyond the scope of this dissertation; hence, we leave this tier colourless (not green). The normative aspect of ethical leadership was also acknowledged in the seminal definition with the phrase ‘normative appropriateness’, which refers to the notion that ethics and ideal behaviour are also subject to cultural sub-values and at times differ from each other. However, this study does not assume that normative values, at any point, clash with other tiers of values, that is, basic and evolving values. Hence, for theory development, it is intentionally left blank to acknowledge the gaps and make room for more focused and culturally informed studies in the future. See recommendations for future research below.

The third tier refers to contemporary or evolving values. All such values have not been part of the basic ethical behaviour mandate but have been added over time. These sub-values relate to, virtues such as concern for the environment, optimism, attention to diversity and adherence to human rights. They are part of the broader ethical leadership conceptualization. We speculate that such sub-values should essentially become part of basic virtues with more ethical awareness as new and
more evolving values are identified over time. Figure 1 shows the three-tier value model of the broader ethical leadership conceptualization that is developed in this dissertation and illustrated across the three-tier model pyramid. Since the broader conceptualization of ethical leadership includes both basic and evolving sub-values, both the first and third tiers are shown in green.

![Three-tier value model of broader ethical leadership conceptualization](image)

**Ethical leadership Styles**

Although the existing literature acknowledges that the seminal construct of ethical leadership is linked to other leadership styles (including transformational and transactional leadership), it was considered distinct. A preliminary idea of leadership styles being ethical styles was proposed by Van Wart (2014) and further developed and tested empirically in this dissertation. The results can be translated in multiple logical ways. The broader ethical leadership conceptualization includes components of numerous other leadership styles, including positive, transactional, moral manager, professionally grounded, socially responsible (including CSR, spiritual, and servant Leadership) and transformational leadership styles. However, the analysis does not reveal the representation of definite factors corresponding to individual leadership styles. Thus, empirically, these styles...
are not found to be separate and distinct from each other. The broader ethical leadership conceptualization includes components from all of these associated styles represented in one dimension. Theoretically, it can be interpreted that ethical leadership is an amalgam of ethical components of all associated leadership styles. Chapter 3 assumes that ethical leadership functions as a process, making four broad functional assumptions of ethical leadership in association with other styles. The processual viewpoint depicts not a different conceptualization but a functional aspect of the broader conceptualization. It is possible to view these leadership styles in the three-tier model to assess their value categories. However, their functional aspect remains best explained through the assumptive illustrations shown in Chapter 3 of this dissertation. These assumptions include, among others, the ethical leadership quadrants. As discussed above, the empirical validation of broader ethical leadership conceptualization makes all associated leadership styles an essential part of the broader ethical leadership construct. These findings are also in line with the ethical leadership quadrants. These quadrants show numerous ethical leadership styles along the axis of ethics and external orientation; e.g., transformational leadership is depicted with high ethics and a high external orientation, whereas pseudo-transformational leadership has low ethical value and a high external orientation. In light of the broader ethical leadership conceptualization, we believe that all of these leadership styles, as illustrated through the quadrants, have a positive and corresponding (low) ethical leadership value. Figure 2 demonstrates the positioning of various leadership styles across the three-tier model based on their value composition. Virtuous leadership and parts of positive leadership (resilience) constitute the first level of the model. Although the moral manager relates to a set of promotional activities of moral conduct, the main focus of these activities is organizational rules and regulations; hence, we place all of these leadership styles in the first level of the model. All other leadership styles, such as servant, spiritual, CSR, professionally grounded and ethical transformational, are placed in the third level of the model. These leadership styles differ from those at the first level because they reject traditional leader-follower authoritarian behaviour and advocate for a more relationship-based association with followers, where leaders are often seen as caring mentors and rather than powerful authoritarians. I place professionally grounded leadership at this level of the model because it demonstrates a novel ethical competency in which decisions are based on moral principles in the event
of contradictory and complex legal situations not easily addressed through rules and regulations.

Now, we return to the discussion about distinguishing values from promotional activities to highlight the achievements of the dissertation. One of the key challenges to broader ethical leadership is understanding the puzzle behind its function. The seminal construct put forward by Brown and colleagues (2005) describes ethical leadership as a function of the moral person (values) and the moral manager (activities for the propagation of ethical conduct, such as communication, role modelling, or reinforcement). Similarly, the broader conceptualization function should also outline a combination of values and activities that shows how these values need to be propagated. The broader conceptualization provides a list of values but offers no substantive additional activities beyond existing moral manager activities to propagate ethical values.

Although a detailed list of such promotional virtues is still missing, the broader conceptualization makes some new additions to the moral manager activities within the seminal construct. Some of the key changes to the existing moral manager include avoidance of punishment culture (encouraging only a reward-based culture), but do these changes also add to the list of propagation activities? I believe that the broader construct needs to dissect values from activities for a better understanding of the function of ethical leadership. To easily distinguish between values and activities of propagation, I present two tables (1 and 2) that
show values and activities undertaken to promote these values. Table 1 shows the values and activities proposed by the seminal construct, whereas Table 2 shows a possible dissection of values and activities of the broader conceptualization.

Table 1. Ethical leadership function (the seminal construct by Treviño et al., 2000; Treviño et al., 2003; Brown et al., 2005)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Promotional virtues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Truthfulness (moral person)</td>
<td>Two-way communication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>Reinforcement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisdom</td>
<td>Decision making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follower oriented</td>
<td>Role modelling</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1 lists ethical values and promotional activities that are considered essential parts of ethical leadership by the seminal studies (Treviño et al., 2000; Treviño et al., 2003; Brown et al., 2005). The left column represents values that are part of the moral person dimension of this seminal conceptualization. The promotional activities within the second dimension (moral manager) are listed in the right column of Table 1. Table 2 (below) shows the same set of values (while also including evolving values) and promotional activities (with some additions) as part of the broader conceptualization. These values and activities are listed as a set and do not correspond with each other. Put simply, each value can be promoted through multiple activities and does not relate to a single promotional technique (activity).

Table 2 Ethical leadership function (broader conceptualization)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Values</th>
<th>Promotional virtues</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Truthfulness (moral person)</td>
<td>Two-way communication (moral manager)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>Reinforcement (moral manager)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisdom</td>
<td>Decision making (moral manager)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follower oriented</td>
<td>Role modelling (moral Manager)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society oriented</td>
<td>Healthy optimism (positive leadership)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principles oriented</td>
<td>Learning motivation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human rights oriented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment oriented</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change oriented Diversity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resilience</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tables 1 and 2 show a clear distinction between values and activities to help understand how ethical leadership theory has progressed in terms of values and promotional activities. The leadership styles (virtuous, professionally grounded, authentic, and socially responsible styles such as spiritual, CSR, and servant leadership) serve as grounds for values, whereas learning motivation and healthy
optimism are activities that can be performed to uphold and instill these values in followers.

This distinction between values and activities has also been outlined in the broader ethical leadership definition. It distinguishes promotional activities “that advocate learning motivation, healthy optimism and clarity of purpose” from values “to uphold the values of empowerment, service to others, concern for human rights, change for betterment and fulfilling duty towards society, future generations, environment and its sustainability”. However, we still lack more detailed virtues for corresponding sub-values. For instance, the identification of detailed virtues pertaining to the sub-values of sustainability, human rights and diversity, such as activities that can mark the presence or absence of these orientations in leaders, is still missing. Although the moral manager (which served as an ethical propaganda tool of the seminal construct) is also a part of the broader ethical leadership conceptualization, as shown in Table 2, the associated promotional activities may not suffice to cover the broader ethical mandate. The promotional activities of the moral manager may suffice for simple integrity relating sub-values but may not be suitable for sub-values with an intra-organizational scope. For example, promoting and addressing environmental and diversity issues or upholding human rights might require campaign activities other than existing ones conducted by, for example, fostering public awareness using videos highlighting environmental concerns and social issues via media outlets.

Ethical leadership in public organizations

Some additional points that merit attention are, first, incorporating ethical leadership in strategic planning. This is important because ethical leadership has positive and negative consequences for organizations that face high-stress situations. Existing studies in the public sector have established links between ethical leadership and reduced absenteeism (Hassan et al., 2014). However, in addition to its apparent benefits, ethical leadership has been linked with unethical pro-organization behaviour (Miao et al., 2014). The link with undesired outcomes requires strategizing ethical leadership behaviour. This implies making ethical leadership an essential part of planning during strategy formulation and chalking out a well-planned agenda of ethical behavioural discourse throughout organizations.
Previously, ethical leadership might have been optional. However, due to the complexity of unique dilemmas, the decision making involved, and the risk of damaged reputation, ethical leadership is now a necessity of any organization. There is a dearth of ethical leadership studies in the public sector. Ethical leadership is particularly important for the public sector due to the trust of citizens involved. In contrast to previous assumptions, ethical leadership cannot be fostered with a one-time training for incumbent leaders; rather, it must be developed in an essential ongoing process.

6.4 Limitations

The studies in this dissertation have both minor and major limitations. The minor limitations include a prevalence of positively assessed themes in the broader definition that could have been developed further (see Alvesson & Einola, 2019; Hughes, Lee, Tian, Newman, & Legood, 2018; Sidani & Rowe, 2018), an absence of inquiry into more promotional activities to strengthen the broader conceptualization, a lack of a comprehensive pilot to test the scale and not tapping the normative norms of the Dutch public sector. The major limitations include a lack of a linkage between ethical leadership and other expected behaviours of leaders and a lack of an interaction perspective. The data provided by leaders could also be coupled with the assessment of leaders by their followers, which for practical reasons could not be part of this study. This study primarily focused on the public sector and may not be directly related to or interpreted for leaders in the private sector. Furthermore, the BELS is a 33-item measurement scale, which could be a problem since the literature tends to develop shorter survey scales (Yukl et al., 2013). Hence, whether the length of the BELS is a limitation is a matter for further testing.

6.5 Recommendations for future research

Future researchers should focus on a number of aspects that were not covered within this dissertation. Foremost, future research should inquire into the consequences of ethical leadership for employees, leaders and organizations. Assessments of leaders can include self-assessments and assessments by subordinates. Furthermore, after more validation the BELS can be used to design dilemmas to develop the ethical competency of leaders and serve as a guiding tool
for interviews. The state-of-the-art literature now includes methods using artificial intelligence through tools such as ASReview, which can offer greater efficiency due to an increasing number of ethical leadership studies (Van de Schoot et al., 2020).

Further, the BELS can be used to evaluate current and historical leaders through multiple data sources. The BELS can also be used by consultancy services in developing training programmes for existing leaders and serve as an inspiration to develop courses pertaining to ethical management.

The ethical mandate prescribed in the broader conceptualization could help in revisiting ethical codes of conduct and guide decisions made by ethical committees. This is especially true for leaders in the public sector, as issues pertaining to human rights are central to the concept of the inclusion of minorities and similar groups. Values such as resilience, optimism, and responsiveness to externalities (which is central to the broader ethical leadership conceptualization) shaping ethical and responsible behaviour by leaders can be best understood in times of crisis such as the COVID-19 outbreak in 2019-2020, where delayed responses by public leaders to externalities were not only a matter of choice and leadership style but also a matter of ethical responsibility. The delays represented plausible grounds for accusations of unethical behaviour that resulted in national crises for some countries. The broader conceptualization of ethical leadership has particular relevance in this regard for the public sector and for public leaders who are involved in high-responsibility decision making. In addition to the scarcity of studies in the public sector, there is a dearth of ethical leadership studies in the judiciary context, which can be addressed through multiple methods with the BELS as a framework of reference.

According to the three-tier model of values, the second normative level is unexplored; thus, future researchers can focus more on the multiple cultural, regional and inter-sectoral comparisons. Differences across cultures (collective and non-collective), regions (European and Asian) and sectors (public, private and non-profit) can reveal the differences and cover the normative level of the three-tier value model of ethical leadership. Similarly, some research suggests that people belonging to individualistic and collective cultures respond differently to moral judgements (Snarey, 1987, as cited in Hock, 1975). One such study examined Kohlberg’s model with a sample of people from collective cultures; it included
moral judgements that were not present in any level of the studied model and pertained to community welfare (Snarey, 1987, as cited in Hock, 1975). An interesting line of research into ethical leadership is to explore the generational differences between leaders. Information regarding possible similarity between leaders belonging to the same generation can help identify problematic behaviour and assess and train leaders.

Finally, the current conceptualization must be further developed by identifying more promotional activities that can be used to promote ethical behaviour in followers. Research into the use of technology-driven platforms such as social media to promote ethical communication currently seems relevant. Research should also inquire whether certain promotional activities are more relevant for certain sectors as leaders increasingly turn to social media for communication.
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Appendix A: Broader Ethical Leadership Scale (BELS)

The appendix displays all items of Bels with selected items denoted in Italics by an asterisk. It shows standardized factor loadings of 35 and 33 items scale.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Item “I, as leader ...”</th>
<th>Source of Item</th>
<th>Ethical leadership Style</th>
<th>Factor Loadings in 35 item scale</th>
<th>Factor Loadings in 33 item scale</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>*Show strong concern for ethical and moral values (ELQ) Yukl et al. 2013</td>
<td>Virtuous Leader</td>
<td>.504</td>
<td>.49</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>*Am honest and can be trusted to tell the truth (ELQ) Yukl et al. 2013</td>
<td>Virtuous Leader</td>
<td>.623</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>*Am fair and unbiased when assigning tasks to members (ELQ) Yukl et al. 2013</td>
<td>Virtuous Leader</td>
<td>.441</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>*Exercise sound reasoning in deciding on the optimal course of action Wang and Hackett, 2016</td>
<td>Virtuous Leader</td>
<td>.326</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>*Insist on doing what is fair and ethical even when it is not easy (ELQ) Yukl et al. 2013</td>
<td>Virtuous Leader</td>
<td>.611</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>*Acknowledge mistakes and take responsibility for them (ELQ) Yukl et al. 2013</td>
<td>Virtuous Leader</td>
<td>.544</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>*Regard honesty and integrity as important personal values (ELQ) Yukl et al. 2013</td>
<td>Virtuous Leader</td>
<td>.589</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>*Oppose the use of unethical practices to increase performance (ELQ) Yukl et al. 2013</td>
<td>Virtuous Leader</td>
<td>.439</td>
<td>.42</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>*Hold members accountable for using ethical practices in their work (ELQ) Yukl et al. 2013</td>
<td>Virtuous Leader</td>
<td>.513</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Source of Item</td>
<td>Ethical leadership Style</td>
<td>Factor Loadings in 35 item scale</td>
<td>Factor Loadings in 33 item scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>*Keep my actions consistent with my stated values</td>
<td>Van Wart (2014)</td>
<td>Authentic Leader</td>
<td>.494</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>*Am aware of my personal values</td>
<td>Van Wart (2014)</td>
<td>Authentic Leader</td>
<td>.557</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>*Can be trusted to carry out promises and commitments</td>
<td>Van Wart (2014)</td>
<td>Authentic Leader</td>
<td>.599</td>
<td>.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Am an optimist</td>
<td>Van Wart (2014)</td>
<td>Positive Leader</td>
<td>.373</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>*Prefer openness in all situations</td>
<td>Van Wart (2014)</td>
<td>Positive Leader</td>
<td>.453</td>
<td>.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>*Communicate clear ethical standards for members</td>
<td>(ELQ) Yukl et al. 2013</td>
<td>Moral Manager</td>
<td>.414</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>*Set an example of ethical behavior in my decisions and actions</td>
<td>(ELQ) Yukl et al. 2013</td>
<td>Moral Manager</td>
<td>.603</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>*Set an example of dedication and self-sacrifice for the organization</td>
<td>(ELQ) Yukl et al. 2013</td>
<td>Moral Manager</td>
<td>.433</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>*Am Fair and objective when evaluating member performance and providing rewards</td>
<td>(ELQ) Yukl et al. 2013</td>
<td>Moral Manager</td>
<td>.492</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>Have concern for legal and organizational rules</td>
<td>Van Wart, 2014</td>
<td>Moral Manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>*Clarify who is responsible for what</td>
<td>(ELW) Kalshoven et al. 2011</td>
<td>Moral Manager</td>
<td>.390</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Source of Item</td>
<td>Ethical leadership Style</td>
<td>Factor Loadings in 35 item scale</td>
<td>Factor Loadings in 33 item scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>*Am committed to lifelong learning</td>
<td>Thun and Kelloway, 2011</td>
<td>Professionally grounded leader</td>
<td>.451</td>
<td>.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>*Am able to distinguish between competing values</td>
<td>Van Wart, 2014</td>
<td>Professionally grounded leader</td>
<td>.501</td>
<td>.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>Am guided by principles rather than rules</td>
<td>Van Wart, 2014</td>
<td>Professionally grounded leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>*Show concern for others</td>
<td>Dennis and Bocarnea, 2005</td>
<td>Servant Leader</td>
<td>.480</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>*Empower others with opportunities so that they develop their skills</td>
<td>Dennis and Bocarnea, 2005</td>
<td>Servant Leader</td>
<td>.499</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Have a demeanor of humility</td>
<td>Dennis and Bocarnea, 2005</td>
<td>Servant Leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>*Encourage wellness and assistance programs</td>
<td>Van Wart, 2014</td>
<td>Spiritual Leader</td>
<td>.493</td>
<td>.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>*Encourage diversity practices</td>
<td>Van Wart, 2014</td>
<td>Spiritual Leader</td>
<td>.362</td>
<td>.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>*Encourage bereavement programs</td>
<td>Van Wart, 2014</td>
<td>Spiritual Leader</td>
<td>.476</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Contribute to campaigns and projects that promote the well-being of the society</td>
<td>Turker, 2009</td>
<td>CSR</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>*Make investment to create a better life for future generations</td>
<td>Turker, 2009</td>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>.441</td>
<td>.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item No.</td>
<td>Item</td>
<td>Source of Item</td>
<td>Ethical leadership Style</td>
<td>Factor Loadings in 35 item scale</td>
<td>Factor Loadings in 33 item scale</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>*Respect human rights beyond the legal requirements</td>
<td>Van Wart, 2014</td>
<td>CSR</td>
<td>.318</td>
<td>.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Show concern for sustainability issues</td>
<td>(ELW)</td>
<td>Transformational Leader</td>
<td>.360</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>*Emphasize the collective mission</td>
<td>(MLQ) Avolio et al. 1999</td>
<td>Transformational Leader</td>
<td>.530</td>
<td>.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>*Suggest different angles</td>
<td>(MLQ) Avolio et al. 1999</td>
<td>Transformational Leader</td>
<td>.480</td>
<td>.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>*Focus on strength of employees</td>
<td>(MLQ) Avolio et al. 1999</td>
<td>Transformational Leader</td>
<td>.484</td>
<td>.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>*Am also responsible for society and the environment of my organization</td>
<td>Added</td>
<td>Transformational Leader</td>
<td>.447</td>
<td>.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Do not believe that sustainability is a vital function for a good leader</td>
<td>Added, reverse of transformational Leader</td>
<td>Transformational Leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>*Believe that only rules are not enough</td>
<td>Added, reverse of moral manager</td>
<td>Moral manager</td>
<td>.373</td>
<td>.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>Think that rewards and punishments are not useful in the long run</td>
<td>Added, reverse of moral manager</td>
<td>Moral manager</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>I assign tasks to employees based on my personal preferences</td>
<td>Reverse of 3</td>
<td>Virtuous leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>I like to be treated with the respect that I deserve based on my position</td>
<td>Reverse of 27</td>
<td>Servant leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>I am a pessimist</td>
<td>Reverse of 14</td>
<td>Positive leader</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Items in bold and italics are included in the 33 or 35 scale*
Appendix B

Questionnaire for respondents excluding social desirability scale to be answered on Likert scale

Geef aan in welke mate de onderstaande stellingen op u, als leidinggevende, slaan: Als leidinggevende:

1. Hecht ik veel belang aan normen en waarden.
2. Ben ik eerlijk en kan men erop vertrouwen dat ik de waarheid spreek.
3. Ben ik eerlijk en objectief als ik de prestaties van medewerkers evalueer en beloningen uitdeel.
4. Hecht ik veel belang aan regels en voorschriften.
5. Sta ik erop om dat te doen wat eerlijk en ethisch is, ook als dat niet makkelijk is.
6. Vind ik duurzaamheid geen kernwaarde voor goed leiderschap.
7. Geef ik fouten toe en neem ik de verantwoordelijkheid daarvoor
8. Spreek ik medewerkers erop aan dat zij ethisch correct handelen.
9. Handel ik in overeenstemming met mijn eigen waarden.
10. Kan ik goed omgaan met tegenslagen.
11. Ben ik een optimist.
12. Geloof ik dat regels alleen niet genoeg zijn.
14. Toon ik in mijn werk dezelfde toewijding en opoffering die ik van medewerkers verlang.
15. Maak ik duidelijk wie verantwoordelijk is voor welke taak.
16. Ben ik overtuigd dat we ons hele leven blijven leren.
17. Ben ik in staat om tegenstrijdige waarden te onderscheiden.
18. Denk ik dat beloningen en sancties uiteindelijk niet nuttig zijn.
19. Laat ik mij meer leiden door principes dan door formele regels.
20. Houd ik rekening met anderen in de beslissingen die ik neem.
22. Neem ik een nederige houding aan.
23. Ben ik ook verantwoordelijk voor de samenleving en de omgeving van mijn organisatie.
24. Moedig ik ondersteuning van medewerkers door collega’s aan.
25. Moedig ik diversiteitsbeleid aan.
26. Geef ik altijd de voorkeur aan openheid van zaken.
27. Laat ik medewerkers weten welke ethische standaarden voor hen gelden.
28. Besteed ik veel aandacht aan het welzijn van mijn medewerkers.
29. Deel ik taken toe aan medewerkers op basis van mijn persoonlijke voorkeuren.
30. Doe ik mee aan campagnes en projecten die bijdragen aan een betere samenleving.
31. Streef ik naar een beter leven voor toekomstige generaties.
32. Ben ik me bewust van mijn persoonlijke waarden.
33. Kan men erop vertrouwen dat ik mijn beloftes en afspraken nakom.
34. Vind ik mensenrechten belangrijker dan wettelijke voorschriften.
35. Wens ik graag met het respect behandeld te worden dat past bij mijn positie.
36. Beschouw ik eerlijkheid en integriteit als belangrijke persoonlijke waarden.
37. Ben ik tegen onethische praktijken zelfs als die leiden tot betere prestaties.
38. Hecht ik veel waarde aan duurzaamheid.
39. Benadruk ik de gemeenschappelijke missie van onze afdeling.
40. Deel ik taken eerlijk en objectief toe aan medewerkers.
41. Denk ik grondig na voordat ik een beslissing neem.
42. Stel ik voor om vanuit verschillende invalshoeken te kijken naar problemen.
43. Focus ik op de sterke punten van mijn medewerkers.
English Summary

Moral lapses in leadership across all sectors have paved the way for increased interest in the academic domain of ethical leadership. The research within ethical leadership, however, is still in its infancy. In this dissertation, we divide ethical leadership as a desired behaviour (value) into three component sub-values; basic, normative and evolving. We argue that a better understanding of the term ethical leadership is possible by including (or discussing) an exhaustive list of virtues within all three sub-values. To that end, this dissertation aims to investigate how ethical leadership can be conceptualized, defined and measured. In answering these questions, a part of this dissertation also discusses the association of ethical leadership and similar leadership styles.

The seminal construct and shortcomings

Ethical leadership was earlier put forward as a two-dimensional conceptualization; the moral person and the moral manager. While the moral person component referred to the personal values of the leader her/himself, the moral manager was a set of activities that were used as a tool by leader to propagate ethical behaviour in followers. These activities are also part of the seminal definition of ethical leadership which defines ethical leadership as, “the demonstration of normatively appropriate conduct through personal action and interpersonal relationships, and the promotion of such conduct to followers through two-way communication, reinforcement, and decision-making” (Brown et al., 2005, p. 120).

In our first study (See Chapter 2), we make use of a structured literature review to explore popular conceptualizations, definitions, measurement scales and public sector contributions of ethical leadership studies. This study suggests that the two-dimensional conceptualization as well as associating definition and measurement tool (the ethical leadership scale ELS) has been cited in many studies. However, the literature also reports on the use of other conceptualizations, definitions and measurement scale of ethical leadership. The presence of multiple conceptualizations of ethical leadership not only depicts a lack of consensus among scholars but also hinders replication and cross-analysis of existing research studies.
Ethical leadership and relating leadership styles

A discussion of similarities and differences in the varying ethical leadership conceptualizations is possible by studying the components of these conceptualizations and the interplaying functions of these components (See chapter 3). The two-dimensional conceptualization offers a clear structure in itself; however, it does not offer answers to the possible association of this conceptualization to ethical components of other leadership styles. The study of Van Wart (2014) provides a broader conceptualization by providing an amalgam of ethical components of the various leadership styles. These include virtuous, authentic, positive, moral manager, professionally grounded, social responsibility (including servant, spiritual and CSR) and transformational leadership styles.

To help understand the interplay of ethical components within this broader conceptualization, chapter 3 provides multiple propositions with illustrations. These propositions include the ethical leadership timeline, steps of ethical leadership process, concentric circles and the two-dimensional model of ethical leadership. The ethical leadership timeline portrays various leadership styles on a timeline with an increasing external orientation from left (with little/no external orientation) to right (with maximum external orientation). This proposition shows virtuous leadership on the left side with little or no external orientation. Towards an increasing external orientation from left to right are authentic, positive, moral manager, professionally grounded, socially responsible and transformational leadership on the right side (with maximum external orientation). The timeline is developed and elaborated further in the steps of the ethical leadership process. This illustration follows a similar pattern as the timeline, however, with leader roles for corresponding styles on timeline in six distinct steps. The steps provide actionable ethical guidelines for leaders to grow externally by developing individual ethics, setting a benchmark and welcoming feedback, guidance based on rules, developing principles, service to all and implementing ethical mandate together with all stakeholders.

Leaders are known to depict multiple leadership styles at one time. Such co-existence of multiple approaches within one leader is illustrated in the concentric circles of ethical leadership (Chapter 3). The concentric circles show virtuous leadership at the centre of all external circles (with each circle depicting a distinct leadership style). The central position of virtuous leadership denotes its importance
as essential component of ethical leadership. Although virtuous leadership may have no external orientation and cannot represent other styles, all ethical leadership styles have virtuous leadership as an essential central component. Similarly, transformational leadership (which represents the outermost circle) includes all other leadership styles as essential components. Hence, all virtuous leaders may not be transformational leaders, but all transformational leaders are virtuous leaders. Similarly, the two-dimensional model (ethics and external orientation) of ethical leadership portrays that some leaders may use similar skills to pursue selfish needs, for instance, transformational leaders can be high on ethics to pursue interests of all or low on ethics (pseudo-transformational actors) to pursue self-interests.

Broader Ethical leadership conceptualization and measurement scale

For the sake of discussion, this dissertation has distinguished two types of ethical leadership studies; the classic and contemporary. The classic studies refer to the studies that present, promote and use the seminal conceptualization of ethical leadership, whereas the contemporary studies refer to the portion of literature that also considers some evolving sub-values as part of ethical leadership conceptualization (elements not part of seminal studies). Chapter 4 puts forward a number of limitations of the seminal conceptualization, such as: focus on negative reinforcement, lack of focus on empowerment, vagueness in describing normative appropriateness, lack of focus on role clarification, leader learning and environmental sustainability. Similar to these limitations is the absence of established linkages to associating leadership styles. It is argued that the categorization of ethical leadership by Van Wart (2014) covers most of these limitations and hence can be considered an essential broader direction for ethical leadership. This categorization also takes into account associating leadership styles by putting forward an amalgam of ethical components of all leadership styles. Taking the broader conceptualization of ethical leadership into account, it is defined as, “Ethical leadership is the implicit and explicit pursuit of desired ethical behavior for self and followers through efforts governed by rules and principles that advocate learning motivation, healthy optimism and clarity of purpose to uphold the values of empowerment, service to others, concern for human rights,
change for betterment and fulfilling duty towards society, future generations, environment and its sustainability.” The presence of a broader conceptualization of ethical leadership renders all existing measuring scales of ethical leadership (based on seminal conceptualization) insufficient. Therefore, based on the broader conceptualization presented in this study, a new questionnaire, the broader ethical leadership scale (BELS) is proposed which uses new as well as existing items imported from various leadership survey scales.

**Testing the broader ethical leadership conceptualization and measurement scale**

The broader ethical leadership conceptualization and scale undergoes preliminary testing in chapter 5. Based on data collected from 909 public officials working in The Netherlands, an initial confirmatory factor analysis is carried out in AMOS software to investigate if ethical leadership indeed is a sum of various ethical components of leadership styles. The analysis revealed that although many sub-values are also part of new broader ethical leadership conceptualization, however, the component structure proposed in chapter 4 does not hold true. Hence, an exploratory factor analysis is carried out, which reveals broader ethical leadership to be a uni-dimensional model that includes the basic as well as contemporary sub-values. This uni-dimensional model is retested for confirmatory factor analysis in AMOS, which proposes a stronger fit after removing two covarying items.

The broader ethical leadership scale supports a uni-dimensional conceptualization that includes the basic sub-values (which were part of seminal conceptualization) as well as contemporary sub-values which were missing in it. It essentially includes most of the components that were lacking in the seminal conceptualization and overcomes the critique faced by it. Although more tests are still advised to further validate these findings, these initial test results renders the existing seminal conceptualization, definition and measuring scale insufficient.
Conclusion

This dissertation provides substantive answers to the research questions put forward in chapter 1 regarding conceptualization, definition and measuring scale of ethical leadership. Ethical leadership can be considered a uni-dimensional model that includes both basic and evolving sub-values. It can be best defined as, “Ethical leadership is the implicit and explicit pursuit of desired ethical behavior for self and followers through efforts governed by rules and principles that advocate learning motivation, healthy optimism and clarity of purpose to uphold the values of empowerment, service to others, concern for human rights, change for betterment and fulfilling duty towards society, future generations, environment and its sustainability.” Ethical leadership can be measured using the 33-item BELS which takes into account many contemporary evolving values that were lacking in previous measuring scales.

Although the broader ethical leadership conceptualization now includes more virtues across the three-tier classification model put forward in chapter 1. However, more tests are needed before the BELS is validated. A few of methodological shortcomings can be overcome by future studies by using different independent data sets or splitting datasets. Future studies can also use predictive studies or test nomological networks. For now, the broader ethical leadership conceptualization, definition and measuring scale provides sufficient grounds to progress academic dialogue and pave the way for future research.
Nederlandse Samenvatting

Morele tekortkomingen in leiderschap in alle sectoren hebben de weg vrijgemaakt voor een toegenomen belangstelling voor het academische domein van ethisch leiderschap. Het onderzoek naar ethisch leiderschap staat echter nog in de kinderschoenen. In dit proefschrift delen we ethisch leiderschap als gewenst gedrag (waarde) op in drie samenstellende subwaarden; fundamenteel, normatief en evoluerend. We stellen dat een beter begrip van de term ethisch leiderschap mogelijk is door een uitputtende lijst van gedragingen op te nemen (of te bespreken) binnen alle drie de subwaarden. Daartoe beoogt dit proefschrift te onderzoeken hoe ethisch leiderschap kan worden geconceptueleerd, gedefinieerd en gemeten. Bij het beantwoorden van deze vragen gaat een deel van dit proefschrift ook in op de associatie tussen ethisch leiderschap en andere leiderschapsstijlen.

De baanbrekende constructie en tekortkomingen

Ethisch leiderschap werd eerder gedefinieerd als een tweedimensionale conceptualisering; de morele persoon en de morele manager. Terwijl de morele persoonscomponent verwees naar de persoonlijke deugden van de leider zelf, verwees de morele manager naar een reeks activiteiten die door de leider werden gebruikt als een instrument om ethisch gedrag onder volgers te verspreiden. Deze activiteiten maken ook deel uit van de rudimentaire definitie van ethisch leiderschap: “the demonstration of normatively appropriate conduct through personal action and interpersonal relationships, and the promotion of such conduct to followers through two-way communication, reinforcement, and decision-making” (Brown et al., 2005, p. 120).

In onze eerste studie (zie hoofdstuk 2) maken we gebruik van gestructureerd literatuuronderzoek om populaire conceptualiseringen, definities, meetschalen en bijdragen over de publieke sector in onderzoeken naar ethisch leiderschap in kaart te brengen. Deze studie suggereerde dat de tweedimensionale conceptualisering en het bijbehorende definitie-en meetinstrument (de ethische leiderschapsschaal ELS) in een groot aantal onderzoeken zijn aangehaald. De literatuur rapporteert echter ook over het gebruik van andere conceptualisaties, definities en meetschalen van ethisch leiderschap. De aanwezigheid van meerdere conceptualisaties van ethisch leiderschap toont niet alleen een gebrek
aan consensus onder wetenschappers, maar vormt ook een belemmering bij de replicatie en vergelijkende analyses.

**Ethisch leiderschap en bijbehorende leiderschapsstijlen**

Een bespreking van overeenkomsten en verschillen in de verschillende conceptualiseringen van ethisch leiderschap is mogelijk door de componenten van deze conceptualiseringen en de interacties van deze componenten te bestuderen (zie hoofdstuk 3). De tweedimensionale conceptualisering biedt op zich een duidelijke structuur maar het biedt geen antwoord op de mogelijke samenhang van deze conceptualisering met ethische componenten van andere leiderschapsstijlen. De studie van Van Wart (2014) geeft een bredere conceptualisering door een samensmelting van ethische componenten van verschillende leiderschapsstijlen. Deze omvatten deugdzaam, authentiek, positief, moreel manager, professioneel, gegrond, sociale verantwoordelijkheid (inclusief dienaar, spiritueel en MVO) en transformationeel leiderschap.

Om het samenspel van ethische componenten binnen deze bredere conceptualisering te helpen begrijpen, biedt hoofdstuk 3 meerdere stellingen met illustraties. Deze voorstellen omvatten de tijdlijn van ethisch leiderschap, stappen van het ethisch leiderschapsproces, en concentrische cirkels van ethisch leiderschap. De tijdlijn van ethisch leiderschap geeft verschillende leiderschapsstijlen weer op een tijdlijn met toenemende externe oriëntatie van links (met weinig/ geen externe oriëntatie) naar rechts (met maximale externe oriëntatie). Deze stelling toont deugdzaam leiderschap aan de linkerkant met weinig of geen externe oriëntatie. Naar een toenemende externe oriëntatie van links naar rechts staan authentiek, positief, moreel manager, professioneel gefundeerd, maatschappelijk verantwoord en transformationeel leiderschap aan de rechterkant (met maximale externe oriëntatie). In de stappen van het ethisch leiderschapsproces wordt de tijdlijn ontwikkeld en verder uitgewerkt. Deze illustratie volgt echter hetzelfde patroon als de tijdlijn, met leidersrollen voor overeenkomstige stijlen op de tijdlijn in zes verschillende stappen. De stappen bieden uitvoerbare ethische richtlijnen voor leiders om extern te groeien door het ontwikkelen van individuele ethiek, het stellen van een benchmark en feedback te verwelkomen, begeleiding op basis van regels, het ontwikkelen van principes, service aan iedereen en het implementeren van ethisch mandaat samen met alle belanghebbenden.

**Bredere conceptualisering en meetschaal van ethisch leiderschap**

In hoofdstuk 4 worden twee soorten ethisch leiderschapsonderzoek onderscheiden; het klassieke en hedendaagse. De klassieke studies verwijzen naar de studies die de traditionele conceptualisering van ethisch leiderschap presenteren, promoten en gebruiken, terwijl de hedendaagse studies verwijzen naar het deel van de literatuur dat ook enkele evoluerende subwaarden beschouwt als onderdeel van de conceptualisering van ethisch leiderschap (elementen die geen deel uitmaken van de klassieke studies). Hoofdstuk 4 brengt een aantal beperkingen van de klassieke conceptualisering naar voren zoals: focus op negatieve bekrachtiging, gebrek aan focus op empowerment, vaagheid in het beschrijven van normatieve geschiktheid, en gebrek aan focus op roolverduidelijking, leiderschapsleren en ecologische duurzaamheid. Vergelijkbaar met deze beperkingen is de afwezigheid van gevestigde verbanden met bijbehorende leiderschapsstijlen. Er wordt betoogd dat de categorisering van ethisch leiderschap door Van Wart (2014) de meeste van deze beperkingen dekt en daarom kan worden beschouwd als een essentiële bredere richting voor ethisch leiderschap. Deze indeling brengt een samensmelting van ethische componenten van alle leiderschapsstijlen naar voren.
Rekening houdend met de bredere conceptualisering van ethisch leiderschap, wordt ethisch leiderschap in dit proefschrift gedefinieerd als: “Ethisch leiderschap is het impliciete en expliciete nastreven van gewenst ethisch gedrag voor zichzelf en volgers door middel van inspanningen die worden beheerst door regels en principes die leermotivatie, gezond optimisme en duidelijkheid van doel bevorderen, om de waarden van empowerment, dienstbaarheid aan anderen, zorg voor mensenrechten, verandering voor verbetering en het vervullen van plichten jegens de samenleving, toekomstige generaties, het milieu en de duurzaamheid ervan hoog te houden.” De aanwezigheid van een bredere conceptualisering van ethisch leiderschap maakt alle bestaande meetschalen van ethisch leiderschap (gebaseerd op klassieke conceptualisering) onvoldoende. Daarom wordt, op basis van de bredere conceptualisering die in deze studie wordt gepresenteerd, een nieuwe vragenlijst, de bredere ethische leiderschapsschaal (BELS), voorgesteld die zowel nieuwe als bestaande items gebruikt die zijn geïmporteerd uit verschillende leiderschapsschalen.

Toets van de bredere conceptualisering en meetschaal van ethisch leiderschap

De bredere conceptualisering en schaal van ethisch leiderschap worden in hoofdstuk 5 getest. Dit is een eerste stap op weg naar verdere validatie. Op basis van data verzameld van 909 ambtenaren die in Nederland werken, wordt een eerste bevestigende factoranalyse uitgevoerd in AMOS om te onderzoeken of ethisch leiderschap inderdaad een optelsom is van verschillende ethische componenten van leiderschapsstijlen. De analyse laat zien dat hoewel veel subwaarden (die deel uitmaakten van Van Wart’s categorisering maar ontbraken in het klassieke construct) ook deel uitmaken van een nieuwe bredere conceptualisering van ethisch leiderschap, de in hoofdstuk 4 voorgestelde componentenstructuur niet volledig klopt. Daarom is een verkennende factoranalyse uitgevoerd, waaruit blijkt dat breder ethisch leiderschap een eendimensionaal model is dat zowel de basis- als hedendaagse subwaarden omvat. Dit eendimensionale model is opnieuw getest met een bevestigende factoranalyse in AMOS, wat een sterkere fit geeft, na het verwijderen van twee covariërende items.

De bredere conceptualisering en meetschaal van ethisch leiderschap lijkt na voorafgaande tests een eendimensionale conceptualisering te zijn die zowel de
Conclusies

Dit proefschrift geeft inhoudelijke antwoorden op de onderzoeksvragen die in hoofdstuk 1 zijn gesteld met betrekking tot conceptualisering, definitie en meting van ethisch leiderschap. Ethisch leiderschap kan worden beschouwd als een eendimensionaal model dat zowel fundamentele als evoluerende subwaarden omvat. Het kan het best worden gedefinieerd als: “Ethisch leiderschap is het impliciete en expliciete nastreven van gewenst ethisch gedrag voor zichzelf en volgers door middel van inspanningen die worden beheerst door regels en principes die leermotivatie, gezond optimisme en een duidelijk doel voor ogen houden om de waarden van empowerment, dienstbaarheid te handhaven voor anderen, zorg voor mensenrechten, verandering voor verbetering en het vervullen van plichten jegens de samenleving, toekomstige generaties, het milieu en de duurzaamheid ervan.” Ethisch leiderschap kan worden gemeten met behulp van de 33 items in de BELS, de schaal die rekening houdt met veel hedendaagse evoluerende waarden die ontbraken in eerdere meetschalen.

Hoewel de bredere conceptualisering van ethisch leiderschap nu meer deugden omvat in het drieledige classificatiemodel dat in hoofdstuk 1 naar voren wordt gebracht, zijn meer tests nodig voordat de BELS volledig kan worden gevalideerd. De methodologische tekortkomingen kunnen worden verholpen door toekomstig onderzoek waarin gebruik wordt gemaakt van verschillende onafhankelijke datasets of door datasets te splitsen. Toekomstige studies kunnen ook voorspellende studies gebruiken of nomologische netwerken testen. Voorlopig bieden de bredere conceptualisering, definitie en meetschaal van ethisch leiderschap echter voldoende grond om de academische dialoog te bevorderen en geven ze een aanzet tot verder onderzoek.
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ETHICAL LEADERSHIP
A BROADER DEFINITION, CONCEPTUALIZATION AND MEASUREMENT SCALE
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