



UvA-DARE (Digital Academic Repository)

Ethical leadership: through the eyes of employees

Kalshoven, K.

Publication date
2010

[Link to publication](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Kalshoven, K. (2010). *Ethical leadership: through the eyes of employees*.

General rights

It is not permitted to download or to forward/distribute the text or part of it without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), other than for strictly personal, individual use, unless the work is under an open content license (like Creative Commons).

Disclaimer/Complaints regulations

If you believe that digital publication of certain material infringes any of your rights or (privacy) interests, please let the Library know, stating your reasons. In case of a legitimate complaint, the Library will make the material inaccessible and/or remove it from the website. Please Ask the Library: <https://uba.uva.nl/en/contact>, or a letter to: Library of the University of Amsterdam, Secretariat, Singel 425, 1012 WP Amsterdam, The Netherlands. You will be contacted as soon as possible.

Appendix 1

Correlations Between The ELW Dimensions and Leader Personality

Table - Means, standard deviations and correlations among variables Study 2 of Chapter 3

Variables	M	SD	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14
1 Openness to experience	3.96	.40														
2 Extraversion	3.97	.43	.26**													
3 Agreeableness	3.79	.43	-.09	.23**												
4 Conscientiousness	3.51	.45	.04	.13	.35**											
5 Emotional stability	4.22	.42	.32**	.23**	.25**	.16*										
6 ELS	3.77	.37	.01	.02	.15*	.23**	.08									
7 ELW combined	3.67	.36	.02	.08	.17*	.25**	-.01	.89**								
8 Fairness	3.91	.53	-.02	.09	.18*	.06	-.01	.60**	.70**	.84						
9 Power sharing	3.63	.45	-.02	-.02	.22**	.08	-.02	.56**	.62**	.47**	.74					
10 Role clarification	3.80	.45	.12	.05	-.05	.23**	.14*	.53**	.61**	.17**	.19**	.82				
11 People orientation	3.86	.51	.02	.19**	.20**	.18**	-.08	.77**	.85**	.61**	.54**	.39**	.90			
12 Ethical guidance	3.38	.49	.10	.04	-.04	.20**	.02	.66**	.75**	.29**	.31**	.53**	.50**	.88		
13 Integrity	3.88	.64	-.11	-.02	.09	.28**	-.08	.70**	.72**	.47**	.29**	.50**	.56**	.45**	.90	
14 Concern for sustainability	3.09	.64	-.04	.02	.22**	.21**	.05	.35**	.45**	.19**	.07	.31**	.29**	.49**	.23**	.81
15 LMX	3.61	.44	.02	.05	.08	.13	-.06	.76**	.79**	.59**	.52**	.42**	.75**	.54**	.59**	.29**

Note: $N = 150$ * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$. All tests are one-tailed. Cronbach's α appeared on the diagonal.

Introduction

Appendix 1 is supplementary to Chapter 3 of this dissertation. In chapter 3, ethical leadership is operationalized with the ELS (Brown et al., 2005) and three dimensions of the ELW, namely fairness, power sharing and role clarification. The overall scale as well as the other dimensions of the ELW are not presented in that chapter. As the development of the ELW measurement is a key theme of this dissertation, the correlations between the overall ELW scale as well as the various ELW dimensions and leader personality are presented in this appendix.

Rater Agreement

To investigate the justification for aggregating subordinates' responses to characterize the ethical leadership style of the managers, we completed one way-analyses of variance with leaders as the independent variable and the mean scores of two subordinates for the dimensions of ethical leadership as the dependent variables. Results of the one-way Anova analyses showed that the between-group variance was significantly different from zero for all ethical leadership variables (see Bliese, 2000). We calculated the intra-class correlation coefficient ICC(1) (Shrout & Fleiss, 1979). The ICC(1) is an estimate of the degree to which subordinates of the same leader answer similarly. In this study, the ICC(1)'s values were .32 for fairness, .43 for integrity, .27 for people orientation, .32 for power sharing, .24 for role clarification, .32 for ethical guidance and .45 for concern for sustainability. These ICC(1) values are all above the median of perceptual agreement, which is .12 (ranging from .00 to .50) reported in previous literature (James, 1982). These ICC values support the validity of aggregation of the ethical leader behaviors. Thus, we calculated a mean score for all leadership behaviors based on the two subordinates for each leader.

Results and Discussion

Additional to the results presented in chapter 3, the results in the table show that conscientiousness is most consistently correlated with the ethical leadership dimensions, namely role clarification ($r = .23, p < .01$), people orientation ($r = .18, p < .01$), ethical guidance ($r = .20, p < .01$), integrity ($r = .28, p < .01$) and concern for sustainability ($r = .21,$

$p < .01$). Surprisingly, conscientiousness was unrelated to fairness ($r = .06$, *ns*) and as expected conscientiousness was not correlated to power sharing ($r = .08$, *ns*).

Also, agreeableness shows connections with several dimensions of ethical leadership. The significant relationships are found between agreeableness and people orientation ($r = .20$, $p < .01$), fairness ($r = .18$, $p < .01$), power sharing ($r = .22$, $p < .01$) and concern for sustainability ($r = .22$, $p < .01$).

Except for one sub-dimension of ethical leadership, namely consideration ($r = .19$, $p < .01$), extraversion was found unrelated to ethical leadership. Similarly, emotional stability was found unrelated to ethical leadership, except for one sub-dimension labeled role clarification ($r = .14$, $p < .05$).

Conscientiousness emerged as the strongest predictor in that it is most consistently related to multiple ethical leader behaviors, namely role clarification, consideration, ethical guidance, consistency and concern for sustainability. As conscientious leaders are dependable, responsible and act dutiful, the relevance of this characteristic for the ethical potential of leadership is not surprising. In contrast with our expectations, highly conscientious leaders are not perceived as more fair by their subordinates. The fairness component measures as a leader have no favorite subordinates, take your own responsibilities and act altruistically. Moon (2001) argues that conscientious individuals can act with egoistic motives, because they are focused on their own achievements and goals. He argues that the achievement component of conscientiousness is self-oriented and the duty component is other oriented. Studying different facets of conscientiousness in relation to ethical leadership may help further understand these relationships.

Agreeableness shows several relationships with ethical leadership dimensions. Agreeableness was less strong related to ethical leadership and its dimensions than expected. The results showed that agreeableness correlates with fairness, power sharing, people orientation and concern for sustainability. The link between agreeableness and ethical leadership was mostly expected through the people-oriented component of this trait. In line with this, agreeableness was most strongly related to people orientation.

Several factors could explain why the relationships with the other components of ethical leadership were not found. The literature suggests that agreeableness is important

for ethical leadership as agreeable individuals tend to be kind, altruistic and warm and ethical leaders are supposed to be caring, altruistic and concerned about the welfare of their employees. However, perhaps agreeable individuals may also at times be seen as less principled or fair in decision making as their desire to please others and take their needs' into account may mean they treat people differentially. Another potential reason for the limited role of agreeableness for ethical leader behavior is the tendency of agreeable individuals to be overly compliant. Agreeable individuals are likely to adjust their behaviors in trying to accommodate others and perhaps this makes more agreeable leaders less likely to be perceived as consistent and convey about the roles, tasks and ethical codes of conduct.