Pakistan Languages and Humanities Review
www.plhr.org.pk

RESEARCH PAPER

Exploration of Ethical Leadership in Teachers in Government High Schools of Lahore

Rizwan Ahmad* 1   Sumaira Majeed 2   Shamim Ullah 3

1. Assistant Professor, Division of Education, University of Education Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan
2. Assistant Professor (Visiting), University of Education Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan
3. Assistant Professor (Education), Institute of Education and Research, University of the Punjab, Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan

| ***Corresponding Author** | shamimullah.ier@pu.edu.pk |

ABSTRACT

The idea of ethics is frequently discussed in educational settings because it is part of daily life for ethical leadership students. Ethical leadership is someone who adheres to the rules because they are significant to him. The purpose of the research was explore the perception of SSTs regarding ethical leadership (EL) as well as the difference in it with respect to demographic characteristics of SSTs. The research was quantitative and descriptive approach was employed. Cross sectional survey was conducted to collect the quantitative data. Head teachers working in Government High Schools of Lahore made up population of the study. 375 head teachers selected randomly participated in the study. Instrument developed by Langlois (2005) was modified with the researcher's consent. In ELs, a six-point rating scale was employed. School administrators' opinions on ethical leadership (EL) and its supporting variables were found to be above average, which is considered to be a positive rating. On the basis of qualification, there was no discernible variation in EL, but there were considerable differences on the basis of age and experience. The current study demonstrated the need of taking into account the advantages of moral leadership while creating an efficient educational system. The results of this study have an impact on daily activities in educational settings.

KEYWORDS: *Ethical Leadership, Ethics, Justice, Perceptions*

Introduction

Ethics is the capacity to persuade others. This skill is acquired, among other things, through giving orders to others, using force, and wielding authority. Those who understand how to win their colleagues' confidence before demanding obedience are inspiring leaders. Standards implementation will become increasingly challenging, and school administrators' leadership will be tested. The definition of leadership is the capacity to motivate other. In terms of ethics, leadership is the capacity to judge what is right and wrong or acceptable and inappropriate in order to accomplish shared objectives for the organization and subsequently motivate others. The way we treat one another is what ethical leadership (EL) is all about. Our interactions with one another and our behaviors are extremely straightforward in EL. EL connects our interactions and the activities. Due of the likelihood that researchers may discover different meanings of EL; this definition of EL is situation- and content-specific (Mouradian, 2007).

As a consequence of decision-making encompassing the entire business, including colleagues, subordinates, and external clients, ethical leadership is hailed as an organizational benchmark. EL is the practice of modeling normatively acceptable behavior

by one's actions and interactions with others, as well as promoting such behavior among followers through two-way dialogue, reinforcement, and decision-making (Brown et al., 2005; Yukl et al., 2013). The ability to cope with a position that instills dread in public institutions is an essential leadership quality of an EL. Numerous organizational moral blunders led to the emergent issue of ethics in leadership, which fostered more learning about ethics at work and the development of ethical leaders. Organizational failures made workplace ethics a priority by raising awareness of them and encouraging the development of moral leaders (Chikeleze & Baehrend, 2017).

The idea of ethics is one that is frequently discussed in educational settings because it is part of daily life for EL students. Everything we do is governed by ethics. School administrators have paid attention to their own moral development, accepted responsibility for upholding ethical standards, committed to providing ethical care for others, and demonstrated stewardship of others in generalised leadership ethics, which has emerged as the newest and fastest-growing area of applied ethics. Leaders who uphold moral consciousness are moral; they are trustworthy or a role model who participates in improper behaviour that is acceptable to their peers (Cherkowski et al., 2015; Ciula, 2014; Donlvy & Walker, 2011; Hester & Killian, 2011).

Literature Review

EL is someone who adheres to the rules because they are significant to him. Being an EL entails adhering to a wider set of moral principles. IT is outlined in three parts: acts must be legal, organisational leadership must uphold strong ethical standards, and compliance must be continually monitored. An honest individual or moral manager is what is meant by this definition, and having a strong ethical code is essential for accurate reporting. Integrity, honesty, justice, sound judgment, compassion, and care for subordinates and society at large are all characteristics of an ethical person. Using corporate reinforcement and discipline to hold staff accountable for specific actions, together with deliberate and overt task coaching of moral behavior, are all examples of how ethical management affects the behavior of subordinates (Brown & Mitchell, 2010; Jurkiewicz & Giacalone, 2016).

The organization's awareness of ethics, values, and behaviors that should demonstrate comprehension via actions must be upheld by Yaman (2010) listed a number of fundamental characteristics that ethical leaders should have. First and foremost, administrators need to increase morale and value awareness. When acting morally, they make comparable judgments in related situations. Then, one may interact with employees in a more moral manner. Administrators who are responsible for the moral or immoral actions of others must teach others a valuable lesson. Because moral leaders uphold their own moral standards and work to instill these principles in those under them (Trevino et al., 2000).

The ethics in school administration are essential since school systems are systemically complicated systems. Administrators' actions and judgments about education are more heavily influenced by ethics in school management. Because their judgments have a significant influence on a huge number of individuals in the educational system, school leaders must act ethically. Therefore, ethical issues are much more important (Aktan, 2012).

Dimensions of EL

As a consequence of the various moral dilemmas that confront school administrators in the course of their daily operations, they are required to make moral

decisions in trying situations in which they must consider the welfare of all involved. Numerous scholars have developed a framework for describing the characteristics of an ethical educational leadership stance (Branson & Gros, 2014; Cranston et al., 2014; Stefkovitch & Gutierez, 2014).

Different ethical philosophies assume that school administrators can assess and use different ethical ideas in their operations. The ethics of caring, justice, criticism, and professional ethics were all included in these ethical ideas. The ethic of care is defined as a propensity for interpersonal connections, belief in peace, upholding each person's inherent humanity and profound esteem for everyone, love of others, and a resolve to respect people's freedom to be who they are. The justice ethic is concerned with both civic and judicial procedures (Shapiro & Stefkovich, 2016; Starratt, 2004).

Its objectives are to participate in debates, demonstrate managerial accountability, and look for solutions if awareness is questioned. The third component, called the ethic of critique, looks at social inequality. It was also recommended that a communal ethic be combined with several ethical perspectives. "Professional ethic" is a further suggested component, while it may or may not be applicable to other characteristics. Therefore, in order to establish a fundamental conceptual framework for this study, the following explanations of three components, as well as the ethics of profession and ethical sensitivity, are provided. By doing so, readers will have a better understanding of the difficulties facing ethical leadership and decision-making in the present study (Eyal et al., 2011; Langlois et al., 2014)

Ethic of Care

The notion of relational ethics is the source of the care ethics paradigm. The fundamental traits of relational ethics are acknowledged to include engagement, respect for one another, embodied knowledge, and attentiveness to an interconnected world. These fundamental qualities influence the concepts of interdependency, relational personhood, actual discourse, and the significance of community. The care ethic places a strong emphasis on the obligation to treat people with kindness and compassion. The ethics of care are examined in relation to loyalty, trust, and empowerment. This paradigm is based on the idea that everyone of us views and experiences the world differently (Austin, 2006; Shapiro & Stefkovich, 2001).

When Gilligan criticized Kohlberg's theory and proposed a different conception of ethics for resolving moral quandaries, the ethics of caring was born. Being present, listening, understanding, sharing responsibility for another's well-being, fostering and preserving connections, attachment to and abandonment of relationships all fall under the care ethic. She talks on the varied ways that men and women approach moral conundrums. According to her, women are more likely to engage in activities that support and value interpersonal connections and demonstrate empathy for people in charge of them. Contrarily, males are more prone to look for a solution by using impersonal justice criteria (Epley, 2015).

Care ethics focuses on how open-ended process-oriented experiences like modeling, practice, discourse, and confirmation help us grow more adept at connecting in caring relationships. Several ideas of conventional ethics and morality education were addressed by an ethic of care, necessity, and reaction-focus morality. The emphasis of the care ethic in communal living has been on creating, sustaining, and developing pleasant connections rather than on morally complex decision-making or reasoning (Noddings, 2002).

This element focuses on the responsiveness, closeness, and engagement in the relationship between a student and a school administration. Social relationships are crucial to the success of the school, according to school administrators who operate with an ethic of care. The well-being of the people, dealing with their stress, and giving them authority is its main goals. Teachers should also actively examine their own acts of kindness and make sure they are becoming the greatest versions of themselves. The "ethic of care" comprises being prepared to acknowledge people's right to be who they truly are, willing to accept others for who they truly are, and committed to the connection (Starratt, 1991).

By encouraging a sense of morality, the educational leader's job in the ethic of care paradigm is to create a link between the home-school relationship and the classroom. By developing the ethics of care theoretical framework, academics and researchers from the domains of philosophy, developmental psychology, and education have added to this body of knowledge (Goralnik et. al., 2012; Enmis, 2005). The ethics of care provides a framework for choosing our course of action and details the outcomes of those actions. It encourages us to consider who benefited and suffered from a leader's choice, the long-term repercussions of the choice, and how the people will react to the help they get today in the future (Langlois, 2011; Shapiro & Stefkovich, 2011).

Ethic of Justice

This aspect is focused on individual rights, justice, equity, and the fair treatment of everyone. It's been around since the seventeenth century. A law becomes ethical in terms of justice when it transcends a link between people. This feature stemmed from a philosophical perspective on the nature of the world and how individuals felt about their nation. There are two schools of thought on justice ethics. The first point of view emphasizes human rights and is grounded on ideas of justice or equality, according to which everyone ought to be treated equally. However, the second approach emphasizes the rights of the majority even when they might not be advantageous to certain people (McCray & Beachum, 2006; Shapiro & Stefkovich, 2016).

Justice is a crucial component of ethics that we should consider in living moral lives; it is not only a notion to take into account while making moral choices. However, justice is an expression of our shared recognition of each other's essential dignity and understanding that in order for us to coexist in a linked community we must treat one another with respect on an equal footing. When a decision needs to be taken, an ethically responsible leader who values justice will seek to a leader who is aware of the local community, political climate, and history (Bogotch, 2002).

People are driven by their passion and worries, especially by their fear of destruction and want for solace. The social compact that is in place when a person chooses to give up part of his or her freedom in exchange for government protection is also implied by the term "social governance." Justice ethics are ingrained in social perceptions. Justice is a moral standard or method of thinking that individuals should aspire to in all circumstances, not just a collection of rules. Here, the issue of fairness has been emphasised through developing moral principles that serve as benchmarks for wellbeing (Velasquez et al., 2014)

In contrast, according to the second school of thought, a person perceives themselves as essential members of society and believes that their engagement in social life contributes to their own growth. However, both of these conceptions of justice are typically included in schools. Because an individual's decisions are impacted by community consciousness and organizational decisions are the culmination of individual decisions,

workplaces have both individual and organizational perspectives on justice (Langlois, 2011).

In organizational contexts, the ethical application of justice has its limits. People in the society ought to be prepared to go beyond the predetermined limits. Justice ethics, which forms the cornerstone of a principal's legal responsibilities, is mainly concerned with the rightness and wrongness of actions in light of the offenders' intentions. People have the chance to voice their concerns about justice, fairness, and equality inside the legal system. This demonstrates that this kind of ethics believes in the rule of law and strives for betterment (Langlois, 2011).

Ethic of Critique

It is firmly rooted in critical theory, and the ethics of criticism attempts to both challenge the status quo and support society's disadvantaged sections. Many academics push us, according to the criticism of ethics, to investigate not only the law and justice but also other concepts like privilege, power, culture, and language. One might ask the legislators and other people working in the legal and judicial systems questions. Critique ethics encourage individuals to challenge the status quo. The proponents of the critique paradigm challenge us to reflect on our own moral judgements and wonder how often our thinking is influenced by the laws, norms, and values that surround us. This ethic's exclusive purpose thus seems to be to promote alternative values while combating social conventions and power dynamics that denigrate less developed cultures (Robinson & Garratt, 2004).

The ethic of critique pushes us to reevaluate how we view ideas like privilege, power, culture, language, and justice in society. In essence, the comprehension of social class and its inequities is the foundation of the criticism ethic. In their analysis, critical theorists have taken into account socioeconomic rank, gender, and race. The human rights notion is discussed and expanded upon in the criticism paradigm. This idea's proponents reject both needless human suffering and the exploitation of specific people or groups. In this context, critical theorists occasionally care about raising the voices of those who have been marginalized, particularly students. It is frequently stated that this morality is necessary in societies that are more civilised or varied in terms of ethnicity. Some administrators possess moral character that demonstrates a strong critical ethic, and they are able to resolve their moral dilemmas and significantly improve their organizations (Langlois et al., 2014; Norberg & Johnson, 2014; Shapiro & Stefkovich, 2001).

Ethics of criticism is concerned with socioeconomic class, ethics, gender, and other dimensions of diversity, according to Shapiro and Stefkovich (2011). Concerns include (i) those with the capacity to make laws and develop policies, (ii) those that benefitted by such laws, regulations, and policies, and (iii) those in positions of influence over people without such power. Oppression, power, privilege, authority, voice, discourse, and autonomy are all related issues.

A person's critical attitude questioned morality by examining the boundary between what is morally correct and what educational leaders have over time modified to match the norm. In research based on the critical theory, which stressed ethical behavior as one who dealt with injustices among individuals and groups, particularly those connected to socioeconomic status as well as other factors that influenced one's authority and opinion, the ethic of critique was also noted as being deeply ingrained. According to Shapiro and Gross (2013), the ethic of critique via action enables one to reinterpret and recast other ideas like privilege, power, civilization, language, and even justice itself (Vogel, 2012).

The ethic of critique addressed contradictions and brought challenging topics to light through an investigation of laws, rights, and regulations as well as the process for determining justice. The goal of the ethic of criticism, which is based on critical theory and pedagogy, is to make everyone aware of societal inequalities, particularly those that exist in education at all levels (Shapiro & Gross, 2013). This ethical paradigm aimed to introduce unrecognized ideas to educational leaders and to increase morality-maintaining consciousness. Over time, the ethical worldview as well as characteristics related to experience, education, gender, or ethnicity have changed or even become corrupted. According to Shapiro and Gross (2013), these academics and activists challenge the existing quo by eschewing authority's judgments and standards in favor of an ethic that deals with paradoxes, raises challenging issues, and analyses and addresses issues. A leader who operates from a critique ethic sees law and policy as social institutions that uphold inequities, in accordance with Taesung et al. (2014). Furthermore, the multiple interpretations that language took on as a function of law and policy contributed to injustices and distorted reality. The criticism ethic forced school administrators to reevaluate, clarify, and revisit ideas like supremacy, civilization, and societal justice. The goal of the ethic of critique is to challenge the justifications used by the majority to support the status quo as well as the beliefs held by the minority who view it as a given (Taesung et al., 2014).

Ethic of the Profession

The debate expanded on the idea of ethical leadership in the context of professional ethics. This fourth pillar of ethical leadership is unequivocally supported by Shapiro and Stefkovich (2005). However, they contend that these principles are insufficient on their own to direct educational leaders in moral choices. As a result, we've concluded that even when taken as a whole, the ethics of justice, critique, and care do not fully capture the issues that need to be considered when leaders seek to reach moral conclusions in the context of education (Shapiro & Stefkovich, 2001). These ethics are said to ignore the issues that administrators must take into account while making moral decisions in the classroom. These leaders had to be aware of both their personal and professional moral concerns and ethical frameworks because of the particular aspects of judgments that must be made in the educational context. The main goal of professional ethics was to guide judgment as well as to align the best interests of the student with the administrator's own moral principles. They put up the "paradigm of professional ethics" as a fourth ethical framework to close this gap. They gave an explanation of its relevance by stating that the paradigm of professional ethics raises concerns about the professional and social demands of a school leader.

Significance of EL in Schools

The management of schools must priorities ethical leadership. The school administrators are one of the most important elements since they play a huge role in creating a comfortable, safe, and appealing atmosphere. Due to the societal responsibilities of the educational system, leaders must deal with a variety of people, including students, teachers, other staff members, and families. In various social and professional environments, they may be expected to do a variety of activities. Administrators always face moral conundrums as a result of these obligations and demands. They are expected to act honestly in this scenario, abiding by moral principles (Taymaz, 2003; Yirci et al., 2014).

As a result of the pressure to satisfy both internal and external demands, administrators are compelled to act morally. Different leaders are forced to choose between conflicting moral principles. The ideal environment for people to both practice and absorb

moral values for the rest of their life is school. Here, educators and officials work to mound the future generation of residents. According to the study, children spend more time in the classroom than they do at home, where they tend to imitate their professors' personalities. Because of this, schools are crucial for instilling moral principles in the next generation and preserving social peace and quiet (Holland, 2004; Mendes, 2003; Langlois & Lapointe, 2009). They might follow moral principles just like everyone else. Since they are required to uphold moral standards, they are answerable to the organization. Their last social responsibility is to inform the public about these requirements (Celik, 2000).

Material and Methods

This research study was intended to explore the perception of SSTs regarding ethical leadership (EL) as well as the difference in it with respect to demographic characteristics of SSTs. Bases of these objectives, following research objectives were framed:

1. What is the perception of SSTs regarding ethical leadership?
2. What is the difference in ethical leadership based on demographic characteristics of SSTs?

Approach of this descriptive research was quantitative. Cross sectional survey was conducted to collect the quantitative data. Head teachers working in Government High Schools of Lahore made up population of the study. 375 head teachers selected randomly participated in the study. As far as the instrument of the study is concerned, it consisted of a demographic data sheet accompanied by ethical leadership scale (ELS). Demographic characteristics of head teachers measured demographic characteristics (gender, age and qualification). It was created by Langlois (2005) and modified with the researcher's consent. It had 30 things spread throughout EL's five dimensions. In ELS, a six-point rating scale was employed.

Table 1
Subscales of EL

Sub Factors	Items
E. Sensitivity (Ethical Sensitivity)	4, 8, 12,
E. Justice (Ethic of Justice)	2, 6, 10, 14, 17, 21,
E. Critique (Ethic of Critique)	3, 7, 11, 15, 19, 22, 25
E. Care (Ethic of Care)	1, 5, 9, 13, 16, 18, 20, 23, 24, 26

The scale was finalized after the pilot testing conducted on 50 head teachers. In order to ensure the validity, expert opinion was sought. Reliability analysis was performed in SPSS that yielded the value of .86.

The researcher began gathering data when the study equipment was finished. The information was gathered with permission. The data were collected personally by the researcher. The questionnaires were delivered and were received back. The data were analyzed using SPSS. It was cleaned and assumptions were tested. Relevant statistics were applied to the data. Ethical considerations were met. Findings were reported honestly no attempt was made to fabricate.

Results and Discussion

Table 2
Item Wise Descriptive Analysis of ELS

Items	N	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6
Ethic of Care (E. Care)									
E. Leadership 1	376	5.06	1.26	9	11	32	36	96	192

E. Leadership 5	376	5.43	.84	2	9	40	99	220	6
E. Leadership 9	376	5.46	.80	2	2	6	26	116	224
E. Leadership 13	376	4.85	1.03	2	4	34	88	130	118
E. Leadership 16	376	4.47	1.00	2	6	60	125	118	65
E. Leadership 18	376	5.35	.84	2	2	8	43	118	203
E. Leadership 20	376	5.35	.93	2	1	24	25	110	214
E. Leadership 23	376	4.76	1.11	6	4	41	82	132	111
E. Leadership 24	376	4.69	1.08	4	13	32	86	154	87
E. Leadership 26	376	4.73	1.10	5	13	33	67	166	92
Ethic of Justice (E. Justice)									
E. Leadership 2	376	5.21	.99	1	12	8	50	119	186
E. Leadership 6	376	5.46	.82	2	2	10	36	90	236
E. Leadership 10	376	4.81	1.00	1	2	38	95	131	109
E. Leadership 14	376	5.03	1.13	1	18	25	41	129	162
E. Leadership 17	376	4.97	1.11	4	12	20	67	126	147
E. Leadership 21	376	5.53	.81	1	2	8	35	70	260
Ethic of Critique (E. Critique)									
E. Leadership 3	376	5.70	.55	2	6	3	8	87	270
E. Leadership 7	376	4.71	1.04	8	2	24	109	146	87
E. Leadership 11	376	5.07	1.02	4	9	20	56	130	157
E. Leadership 15	376	4.82	1.13	3	3	59	54	130	127
E. Leadership 19	376	5.49	.79	2	4	5	30	96	239
E. Leadership 22	376	4.98	1.04	1	7	33	54	142	139
E. Leadership 25	376	4.47	1.21	10	17	49	82	147	71
Ethical Sensitivity (E. Sensitivity)									
E. Leadership 4	376	4.80	1.03	1	9	19	125	104	118
E. Leadership 8	376	4.89	1.07	5	13	6	94	133	125
E. Leadership 12	376	4.74	.93	1	3	34	98	160	80

Table 2 represents the frequency of responses of respondents and mean and SD of items of ethical leadership.

Table 3
Factor Wise Descriptive Analysis of ELS

Scales	N	M	MPI	SD	Range	Skewness	Kurtosis
E. Sensitivity	376	13.89	4.63	2.72	4-18	-1.42	1.51
E. Justice	376	30.30	5.05	3.15	11-36	-1.76	1.03
E. Critique	376	34.16	4.88	4.21	13-42	-1.13	1.07
E. Care	376	52.48	5.25	4.68	16-60	-1.60	1.71
E. Leadership	376	130.84	5.03	10.92	45-148	-1.74	1.87

Table 3 presents descriptive statistics of EL. The data met the assumption of normality. Responses of head teachers on six point rating scale fall above the scale median near the scale point rarely. As far as the sub scales are concerned, E. Care has the highest mean value (M= 52.48, MPI=5.25, SD=4.68) followed by E. Justice (M=30.30, MPI=5.05, SD=3.15); E. Critique (M=34.16, MPI=4.88, SD=4.21) and E. Sensitivity (M=13.89, MPI=4.63, SD=2.72) respectively.

Table 4
Gender Wise Comparison of ELS

Scale	M	SD	df	t	p	Cohen's *d*/ Effect size r
E. Sensitivity						
Male	14.41	1.79	374	3.28	.00	0.328/0.162
Female	13.58	3.10				
E. Justice						
Male	30.42	2.71	374	.58	.56	0.062/0.031
Female	30.23	3.38				
E. Critique						
Male	33.37	4.29	374	2.80	.00	0.301/0.1486
Female	34.63	4.09				

			E. Care			
Male	51.73	4.19	374	2.39	.02	0.2613/0.130
Female	52.92	4.89				
			E. Leadership			
Male	129.94	9.66	374	1.22	.22	0.133/0.066
Female	131.36	11.58				

No significant difference was observed in EL on the basis of gender as the results of independent sample t-test show in table 4.

Table 5
Descriptive Analysis of EL with Different Age Groups

Variables	N	M	SD
E. Sensitivity			
Below 30	47	13.78	1.97
31-40	110	13.39	3.63
41-50	202	14.15	2.32
Above 50	17	14.23	1.30
E. Justice			
Below 30	47	30.42	2.47
31-40	110	30.59	2.56
41-50	202	29.98	3.59
Above 50	17	31.88	1.76
E. Critique			
Below 30	47	33.06	5.87
31-40	110	35.60	2.91
41-50	202	33.53	4.24
Above 50	17	35.35	2.62
E. Care			
Below 30	47	53.57	3.01
31-40	110	53.21	3.73
41-50	202	51.81	5.37
Above 50	17	52.58	4.03
E. Leadership			
Below 30	47	130.85	9.72
31-40	110	132.80	7.78
41-50	202	129.48	12.64
Above 50	17	134.05	6.55

Age wise descriptive statistics of EL are shown in table 5. On the basis of age respondents were divided into four categories.

Table 6
Age-Wise Comparison of EL

Variables	df	SS	MS	F	p	η²
		E. Sensitivity				
Between groups	3	43.94	14.64	1.99	.11	0.016
Within groups	372	2735.36	7.35			
		E. Justice				
Between groups	3	73.27	24.42	2.49	.06	0.020
Within groups	372	3647.76	9.80			
		E. Critique				
Between groups	3	390.63	130.21	7.74	.00	0.059
Within groups	372	6251.13	16.80			
		E. Care				
Between groups	3	205.27	68.42	3.18	.02	0.025
Within groups	372	8000.59	21.50			
		E. Leadership				
Between groups	3	973.43	324.47	2.75	.04	0.022
Within groups	372	43782.34	117.69			

In order to compare of EL scores of respondents, one way ANOVA was applied using SPSS. The results of analysis are shown in table 6. On the basis of age significant difference was observed in EL, $F (3, 372) = 2.75$, $p=.04$.

Table 7
Descriptive Analysis of EL with Different Qualification Groups

Variables	N	M	SD
E. Sensitivity			
MA/MSc	182	14.20	2.32
MPhil	160	13.32	3.19
PhD	34	14.82	1.48
E. Justice			
MA/MSc	182	29.86	3.83
MPhil	160	30.72	2.14
PhD	34	30.61	2.81
E. Critique			
MA/MSc	182	34.08	4.63
MPhil	160	34.35	3.86
PhD	34	33.70	3.26
E. Care			
MA/MSc	182	51.46	5.70
MPhil	160	53.70	2.96
PhD	34	52.20	3.79
E. Leadership			
MA/MSc	182	129.62	13.23
MPhil	160	132.10	8.41
PhD	34	131.35	6.11

Qualification wise descriptive statistics of EL are shown in table 7. On the basis of qualification, respondents were divided into three categories.

Table 8
Difference in EL Scores on the basis of Qualification

Variables	df	SS	MS	F	p	η²
		E. Sensitivity				
Between groups	2	99.20	49.60	6.90	.00	0.03
Within groups	373	2680.10	7.185			
		E. Justice				
Between groups	2	66.27	33.13	3.38	.03	0.01
Within groups	373	3654.76	9.79			
		E. Critique				
Between groups	2	14.26	7.13	.40	.67	0.00
Within groups	373	6627.51	17.76			
		E. Care				
Between groups	2	429.48	214.74	10.30	.00	0.05
Within groups	373	7776.39	20.84			
		E. Leadership				
Between groups	2	535.97	267.98	2.26	.10	0.01
Within groups	373	44219.79	118.55			

In order to compare of EL scores of respondents on the basis of qualification, one way ANOVA was applied using SPSS. The results of analysis are shown in table 6. On the basis of age no significant difference was observed in EL.

Table 9
Descriptive Statistics of EL on the basis of Experience

Variables	N	M	SD
E. Sensitivity			
Below 10	102	14.46	2.55
11-20	162	13.30	2.98
21-30	101	14.24	2.38

Above 30	11	13.81	1.40
E. Justice			
Below 10	102	31.14	2.70
11-20	162	29.56	2.67
21-30	101	30.48	4.00
Above 30	11	31.63	2.11
E. Critique			
Below 10	102	34.17	4.75
11-20	162	34.20	3.85
21-30	101	34.09	4.37
Above 30	11	34.00	2.00
E. Care			
Below 10	102	53.74	3.63
11-20	162	51.96	4.06
21-30	101	51.92	6.19
Above 30	11	53.54	3.61
E. Leadership			
Below 10	102	133.52	9.19
11-20	162	129.04	9.08
21-30	101	130.75	14.54
Above 30	11	133.00	6.87

Experience wise descriptive statistics of EL are shown in table 9. On the basis of qualification, respondents were divided into four categories.

Table 10
ANOVA Test of Ethical Leadership on basis of Experience

Variables	df	SS	MS	F	p	η²
		E. Sensitivity				
Between groups	3	100.94	33.65	4.67	.00	0.036
Within groups	372	2678.35	7.20			
		E. Justice				
Between groups	3	184.59	61.53	6.47	.00	0.050
Within groups	372	3536.45	9.50			
		E. Critique				
Between groups	3	1.07	.36	.02	.99	1.624
Within groups	372	6640.69	17.85			
		E. Care				
Between groups	3	250.62	83.54	3.90	.00	0.031
Within groups	372	7955.24	21.38			
		E. Leadership				
Between groups	3	1312.85	437.61	3.74	.01	0.029
Within groups	372	43442.92	116.78			

In order to compare of EL scores of respondents on the basis of qualification, one way ANOVA was applied using SPSS. The results of analysis are shown in table 6. On the basis of age significant difference was observed in EL, F (3, 372) = 3.74, p=.01.

Conclusion

School administrators' opinions on ethical leadership (EL) and its supporting variables were found to be above average, which is considered to be a positive rating. The overall results of this study are in support of the concept ELQ, which is made up of four different components of ethical leadership: caring, justice, critique, and sensitivity. On the basis of qualification, there was no discernible variation in EL, but there were considerable differences on the basis of age and experience. The findings are consistent with the study done by Langlois and colleagues. (2014). The findings of the current study and those of other researchers' investigations are comparable (Begley & Johnsson, 2003; Langlois, 2004; Shapiro & Stefkovich, 2003; Starratt, 2004). The findings are consistent with a wide range of studies that have been published in the literature (Arar, 2015; Duignan, 2012; Oplatka &

Arar, 2016; Starratt, 2012). On the basis of gender, no appreciable variation in EL was discovered. The findings of prior study are supported by the literature (Langlois, 2004; Langlois & LaPointe 2010; Langlois et al., 2014). However, other studies have shown conflicting results (Arar et al., 2013). Based on experience, researchers saw a substantial variation in EL. On the basis of experience in EL, a considerable difference was seen concurrently with this investigation (Arar, 2015; Arar et al., 2016; Dempster et al., 2004; Fitch, 2009; Landau & Osmo, 2003; Langlois & LaPointe 2007). This study validated Starratt's framework since it demonstrated that each component of the framework was present in ethical leadership practices. The development of the ELS instrument, which is recognized globally, is supported by this study. This study sheds light on moral leadership in educational settings. As a result, it regularly assists school administrators in making ethical decisions.

Implications

In a school context, ethical leadership is the effort to accomplish a shared goal by deciding what is right or wrong and what is good or terrible in order to influence others ethically. The current study demonstrated the need of taking into account the advantages of moral leadership while creating an efficient educational system. The results of this study have an impact on daily activities in educational settings. The immediate need for administrators to develop moral skills like competence and the creation of moral characteristics in instructional leadership in order to promote social equity in educational settings could be addressed practically by educating coaching programs for school administrators and contributors to the school system. (Langlois et al., 2014). The program teaches school administrators how to be moral in their judgment-making and how to spot potential ethical issues in their organization. It is important to provide a learning environment in which school administrators uphold and regularly practice ethical principles.

Recommendations

It is argued that ethical concerns in the sphere of education might be addressed from all relevant angles. It is recommended that ethical frameworks be implemented at all levels of education, involving both instructors and school administrators. It is proposed that more research is needed to support the outcomes of this study and to identify precise determinants of ethical judgments because the literature and research findings both demonstrate how important ethical leadership is for school leaders. School administrators may foster an environment where school principals discuss issues that concern the whole institution and provide them time to reflect on their objectives and activities. School administrators could offer chances for students to participate in best practices based on research and professional development in the field of ethics.

References

Aktan, C.C. (2012). *The Concept of Business Ethics and Social Responsibility*. ARI Publications.

Arar, K. H. (2015). Leadership for equity and social justice in Arab and Jewish schools in Israel: Leadership trajectories and pedagogical praxis. *International Journal of Multicultural Education*, *17*(1), 162-187.

Arar, K.H., Haj, I., Abramovitz, R., & Oplatka, I. (2016). Ethical leadership in education and its relation to ethical decision-making: The case of Arab school leaders in Israel. *Journal of Educational Administration 54*(6), 647-660.

Austin, W. (2006). Engagement in contemporary practice: A relational ethics perspective. *Texto & Contexto-Enfermagem*, *15*(1), 135-141.

Begley, P. T. & Johansson, O. (2003). *The ethical dimensions of school leadership*. Falmer Press.

Bogotch, I. (2002). Educational leadership and social justice: Practice into theory. *Journal of School Leadership, 12*(2), 138-156.

Branson, C. M., & Gross, S. J. (Eds.). (2014). *Handbook of ethical educational leadership* (pp.229-245). Routledge.

Brown, M. E., & Mitchell, M. S. (2010). Ethical and unethical leadership: Exploring new avenues for future research. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, *20*(4), 583-616.

Brown, M. E., Treviño, L. K., & Harrison, D. A. (2005). Ethical leadership: A social learning perspective for construct development and testing. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes*, *97*(2), 117-134.

Cherkowski, S., Walker, K. D., & Kutsyuruba, B. (2015). Principals' Moral Agency and Ethical Decision-Making: Toward a Transformational Ethics. *International Journal of Education Policy and Leadership*, *10*(5), 1-17.

Chikeleze, M. C., & Baehrend, W. R. (2017). Ethical Leadership Style and its Impact on Decision-making. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, *11*(2), 1-3.

Cranston, N., Ehrich, L. C., & Kimber. M. (2014). Managing Ethical Dilemmas. In C. M. Branson & S. J. Gross (Eds.), *Handbook of Ethical Educational Leadership* (pp.229-245). Routledge.

Dempster, N., Carter, L., Freakley, M., & Parry, L. (2004). Conflicts, confusions and contradictions in principals' ethical decision making. *Journal of Educational Administration 42* (4), 450-461.

Duignan, P. (2012). *Educational leadership: Together creating ethical learning environments*. Cambridge University Press.

Epley, K. M. (2015). Care ethics and Confucianism: caring through Li. *Hypatia*, *30*(4), 881-896.

Eyal, O., Berkovich, I., & Schwartz, T. (2011). Making the right choices: Ethical judgments among educational leaders. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *49*(4), 396-413.

Fitch, W. L. (2009). *A study of relationships between ethical decision making, leadership styles, and demographics in Pennsylvania superintendents* (Unpublished doctoral dissertation). Indiana University of Pennsylvania.

Goralnik, L., Millenbah, K. F., Nelson, M. P., & Thorp, L. (2012). An environmental pedagogy of care: Emotion, relationships, and experience in higher education ethics learning. *Journal of Experiential Education*, *35*(3), 412-428.

Hester, J. P., & Killian, D. R. (2011). The leader as moral agent: Praise, blame and the artificial person. *The Journal of Values Based Leadership*, *4*(1), 93-104.

Holland, P. E. (2004). Principals as supervisors: A balancing act. *Nassp Bulletin*, *88*(639), 3-14.

Jurkiewicz, C. L., & Giacalone, R. A. (2016). How will we know it when we see it? Conceptualizing the ethical organization. *Public Organization Review*, *16*(3), 409-420.

Landau, R., & Osmo, R. (2003). Professional and personal hierarchies of ethical principles. *International Journal of Social Welfare*, *12*(3), 42-49.

Langlois, L. (2004). Responding ethically: Complex decision-making by school district superintendents. *International Studies in Educational Administration*, *32*(2), 78-93.

Langlois, L. (2011). *The anatomy of ethical leadership: To lead our organizations in a conscientious and authentic manner*. Athabasca University Press.

Langlois, L., & Lapointe, C. (2009). Can ethics be learned? Results from the TERA three year Research project. *Journal of Educational Administration*, *48*(2), 147- 163.

Langlois, L., Lapointe, C., Valois, P., & Leeuw, A. (2014). Development and validity of the ethical leadership questionnaire. *Journal of Educational Administration, 52*(3), 310 – 331.

McCray, C., & Beachum, F. D. (2006). A critique of zero tolerance policies: An issue of justice and caring. *Values and Ethics in Educational Administration*, *5(*1), 1-8.

Mendes, E. (2003). Building classroom relationship: What empathy can do. *Educational Leadership*, *61*(1), 56-59.

Mouradian, W. E. (2007). Ethics and leadership in children's oral health. *Pediatric dentistry*, *29*(1), 64-72.

Noddings, N. (2002). *Educating moral people: A caring alternative to character education*. Teachers College Press.

Norberg, K. & Johansson, O. (2014). The ethical demands of multiculturalism. In C. M. Branson & S. J. Gross (Eds.), *Handbook of ethical educational leadership* (pp. 426-438). Routledge.

Oplatka, I., & Arar, K. H. (2016). Leadership for social justice and the characteristics of traditional societies: Ponderings on the application of western-grounded models. *International journal of leadership in education*, *19*(3), 352-369.

Robinson, D., & Garratt, C. (2004). *Introducing ethics: a graphic guide*. Icon Books.

Shapiro, J. P., & Gross, S. J. (2013). *Ethical educational leadership in turbulent times:(Re) solving moral dilemmas*. Routledge.

Shapiro, J. P. & Stefkovich, J. A. (2001). *Ethical leadership and decision making in education: Applying theoretical perspectives to complex dilemmas*. Erlbaum Associates.

Shapiro, J. P., & Stefkovich, J. A. (2011). *Ethical leadership and decision making in education: Applying theoretical perspectives to complex dilemmas* (3rd ed.). Taylor and Francis.

Shapiro, J. P., & Stefkovich, J. A. (2016). *Ethical leadership and decision making in education: Applying theoretical perspectives to complex dilemmas*. Routledge.

Starratt, R. J. (1991). Building an ethical school: A theory for practice in educational leadership. *Educational administration quarterly*, *27*(2), 185-202.

Starratt, R. J. (2004). *Ethical leadership* (Vol. 8). Jossey-Bass.

Taesung, K., Park, J. Y., & Kolb, J. A. (2014). Examining the AHRD standards on ethics and integrity using a multiple ethical paradigms approach. *Human Resource Development Review*, *13*(3), 293-313.

Taymaz, H. (2003). *School Management* (7th ed.). Pegem Academy Publications.

Velasquez, M., Andre, C., Shanks, T., & Meyer, M. (2014). Justice and fairness. *Issues in Ethics, 3*(2), 3-4.

Vogel, L. R. (2012). Leading with Hearts and Minds: Ethical Orientations of Educational Leadership Doctoral Students. *Values and Ethics in Educational Administration*, *10*(1), 1-12.

Yaman, A. (2010). The new role of the internal auditor: ethical leadership. *Supervision*, *7*(5), 9-16.

Yirci, R., Özdemir, T. Y., Kartal, S. E., & Kocabaş, İ. (2014). Teachers' perceptions regarding school principals' coaching skills. *School Leadership & Management Formerly School Organisation*, *34*(5), 454-469. https://doi.org/10.1080/13632434.2014.905465

Yukl, G., Mahsud, R., Hassan, S., & Prussia, G. E. (2013). An improved measure of ethical leadership. *Journal of leadership & organizational studies*, *20*(1), 38-48.