The Ethical Behaviors Of Educational Leaders In Ethiopian Public Universities: The Case Of The Western Cluster Universities

Frew Amsale, MA
Mitiku Bekele, PhD
Mebratu Tafesse, PhDs.
Jimma University, College of Education and Behavioral Sciences, Ethiopia

Abstract:
  The purpose of this study was to assess the extent to which educational leaders in the western cluster public universities of Ethiopia are ethical. Ethical leadership variables such as fairness, equity, multicultural competence, modeling ethical behaviors and altruism are considered in describing the ethical behaviors of the leaders. Descriptive survey research design with quantitative method was employed for it fits the purpose of the study. Data was collected from instructors and educational leaders holding various leadership positions in the sample universities. Accordingly, 107 instructors, 12 department heads, 6 college deans, 2 academic quality assurance officers, 3 ethical officers, 1 vice president and 1 president participated in the study. Questionnaires were mainly used to collect data from the respondents. T-test and ANOVA, among other data analysis tools, were used to analyze the data. The results of the study revealed that leaders in the sample universities practice ethical leadership moderately. The leaders failed to demonstrate the ethical leadership practices to the expected level. They have been found to demonstrate low multicultural competence, low at altruism, and low at modeling ethical behavior. And hence, it could be concluded that the educational leaders in public universities failed to meet the standards and expectations of ethical leadership. As a result, it is recommended that the academic leaders in the public universities need to be provided with leadership development opportunities. Moreover, public universities can establish leadership development programs that will enable leaders to continually update themselves and practice ethical leadership to the expected level.

KeyWords: Ethical Leadership, Universities, Ethiopia

Introduction

The discussion of leadership and ethics is not a recent phenomenon. "The moral goodness of leaders has been a topic of analysis for centuries." (Ciulla & Forsyth, 2010, p. 227). Several evidences existed in ancient religious and philosophical texts (Ciulla , 2011). For example, in the holy Bible, we can see strong concerns about the moral goodness of leaders. In the advice that Jethro, an Ethiopian priest of Median, Moses' father in law, gave to Mosses on how to lead the people of Israel to the land of promise (The Holly Bible: Old and New Testaments: King James Ch 18; V 18-24)

Despite such a place of ethics in the leadership process, ethical leadership has gained recognition as a distinct style of leadership very recently. Currently, the study on ethical leadership has regained importance among scholars and organizations due to the series of unethical acts and scandals in business, government, HEIs, sports, non-profit organizations, and even religious organizations (Treviño & Brown, 2006; Sinha & Mishra, 2011, Mihelič, Lipičnik, & Tekavčič, 2010; Bellingham, 2003, p. vii; Mullane, 2009). Unethical behaviors and acts have become a day to day happenings of the lives of all organizations of today. Sinha & Mishra (2011, p. 135), describe the situation as "Almost every morning in the newspaper we are exposed to the foul play of some executives or organizations".

Ethical leadership has been defined in multiple of ways (Yukl, Mahsud, Hassan, & Prussia, 2011). One of the many definitions the one by Trevino and Brown defines ethical leadership as "the demonstration of normatively appropriate conduct through personal actions and interpersonal relationships, and the promotion of such conduct to followers through two-way communication, reinforcement, and decision-making" (Treviño & Brown, 2006). "Normatively appropriate behavior" is intentionally used to indicate that the concept of ethical leadership has a relative conception to the social, political, cultural, and other perspective in which the subject is treated (Rhode, 2006).

The discussion of ethical leadership covers three major areas. These are the ethics of the leader, the ethics of what the leaders do, i.e. the decision making process and the ethics of the organizational context in which the leaders carry out what they ought to (Mihelič, et al., 2010; Brown & Trevino, 2006; Ciulla, 2005).

The ethics of the leaders is the core ingredients of ethical leadership. The centrality of the ethics of an individual leader in the ethical leadership practices has been backed by several researches and theories. Treviño & Brown(2004), for example have founded theoretical grounds for the significant roles that leaders should play in influencing followers' ethical and unethical behaviors. Accordingly, they have provided sound theorotical justification from Kholberg's cognitive moral development theory, social

learning perspective of Albert Bandura and from social exchange perspectives to show why and how leaders should influence the ethical behaviors of their followers. To this, it is found out that the ethical behavior of leaders is linked with several subordinate related outcomes both at the individual and group levels (Kouzes & Posner,2003). Besides, they have a greater influence over the organizational culture and climate (Jordan, Brown, Treviño, & Finkelstein, 2011). This is because, "leaders help to set the tone, develop the vision, and shape the behavior of all those involved in organizational life" (Gin, 1996, p. 2). The influences of ethical leaders over their subordinates and organizations are, therefore, evident.

Monahan, in his review of the ethical leadership literature in organizations has identified that the ethics of individual leader is one of the essential constructs of ethical leadership (Monahan, 2012). According to the social learning theory, followers and even leaders learn by observing ethical role models' behaviors and the consequenses of their behavior. In this regard, Bandura in Brown and Trevin'o stated that "[b]y observing an ethical role model's behavior as well as the consequences of their behavior, leaders should come to identify with the model, internalize the model's values and attitudes, and emulate the modeled behavior" (Brown & Treviño, 2006, p. 600). "The more the leader "walks the talk", by translating internalized values into action, the higher level of trust and respect he [she] generates from followers" (Mihelič, et al., 2010, p. 33). When leaders remain consistent with their values and pay their personal sacrifices for followers or the organization in general, the employees are more willing to do the same. That is why the moral successes and letdowns of the leaders are said to have greater load than of the non leaders (Ciulla, 2011).

Despite the worthiness of the leaders' ethics in leadership process, it is not clearly and emprically known as to what personal qualities exactly constitute the ethics of the leader (Treviño, Brown, & Hartman, 2003). The problem in this regard might be attributed to shortages of empirical studies on ethical leadership (Treviño, et al., 2003) on one hand and "the difficulty of getting agreement about justifiable moral principles" (Yukl, 2010, p. 410) that particularly work across cultures, and for competing values. To this, diffrenet scholars have different components of individual ethical leader characterstics.

In the qualitative section of a study of ethical leadership practices and perceptions carried out to investigate how ethical leadership is perceived in Ethiopian public universities, Frew, Mitiku and Mebratu have identified the major characteristics of ethical leaders integrity, trustworthiness and honesty, and transparency (Frew, Mitiku & Mebratu, 2014). The authors also pointed out that, ethical leaders are those leaders who themselves are ethical

models for the people they lead and multiculturally competent that they make fair and principled decisions.

The findings the studies on ethical leadership are in consistent with the findings of the aforementioned research. Such leaders' traits as citizenship, respect, responsibility, fairness, caring, and trustworthiness were identified to be the major characteristics of ethical leaders by previous studies (Mullane, 2009;Treviño, et al., 2003).

The findings of the extensive survey conducted by Kouzes and Posner (2007) for about 25 years, to identify what values, personal traits, or characteristics do the participants have a high regard for in a leader and a person that they would be willing to follow (Kouzes & Posner, 2007, p. 29), have shown an amazing consistency across different years, demographics, organizations and cultures. Among those characteristics presented to the participants of the study, only honest, forward-looking, inspiring, competent have always received over 60 percent of the votes over time (with the exception of Inspiring in 1987) (Kouzes & Posner, 2007, p. 29). It might not be surprising to see that honesty has received an outstanding place in all the discussions of ethical leader's behavior. People anywhere are too willing to follow someone in to everywhere —whether it's into the heaven or into the hell, we want to know that the person is truthful (Kouzes & Posner, 2007).

The discussions of ethical leadership in education assume that, "Educational leadership is inherently an ethical activity because its vision and articulation, and process for enrolling others in that vision, seek to make an improvement in individual and collective learning experiences" (Novak, 2002,p.4). Hence, educational leaders are increasingly expected to comply with ethical and moral standards in their relationships and practices. Moreover, incidents of frauds and scams among school leaders appear to be flourishing (Duignan, 2006 as a result "many educational leaders face increasingly demanding and discerning clientele who may challenge the reasons for decisions and the ethical foundations on which they are based" (Duignan, 2006).

Ethical leadership in higher education institutions is of a particular importance for various reasons. Hanson, (2009) states that most decisions in HEIs by their nature involve moral issues. As a result educational leaders cannot simply treat such decisions as day to day activities, rather they are required to make ethical judgments, and hence, needed to be ethical in dealing with such issues of moral implications. HEIs are responsible for the development of their students. In the premise of this, these institutions and their leaders are responsible for the moral development of their students. Ethical leadership cannot be developed through lectures alone. Students better learn ethical leadership by looking at the behaviors of leaders and their teachers. Then, they need to exercise ethical leadership. Besides, those

faculty members who hold either a formal or informal position are entitled to make decisions on issue involving ethical dilemmas. By virtue of these ethical leadership became inescapable agenda of HEI. In affirming this Novak (2002,p.4) stated that "the question is not whether or not educational leaders have to deal with ethical tensions. That they do is a given. The question is how well can educational leaders survive and grow as they deal with ethical issues".

In general, since the emergence of ethical leadership as a field of study is a very recent phenomenon, there is no adequate agreement among scholars in the field as to what exactly constitutes ethical leadership in the organization. However, in one or another way studies on ethical leadership emphasize on the ethical leader behavior. The study, therefore aimed at assessing the extent to which educational leaders in the western cluster universities of Ethiopia.

Context of the Study

Ethiopia is one of the world's ancient civilizations and the home of more than 90 ethnic and linguistic groups (MoE, 2015; WB, 2016). It is one of the most populous countries in sub-saharan Africa with a population of 97.0 million. Its land area is about 1.1 million square km in which 86 people reside in a square km (MoE, 2015).

This demands effective leadership that can deal with the complexity of the reality on the ground and bring about the envisioned change in all sectors and at all levels i.e. local, regional or national. Following the change of the government in 1991, Ethiopia has espoused a Federal government structure that consists of nine regional states and two city administrations. Due to Ethiopia's commitment to its vision of becoming a middle income country in 2025 requires strong, visionary, committed and ethical leadership among other factors for its realization.

Parallel to the economic growth, the education sector in Ethiopia has also shown significant progress at all levels of education including higher education. The public universities which were only two until the 2000 now has increased to more than 40 and several private universities.

Among all other development endeavors by higher education, production of ethical citizens responsible to effectively lead the nation so that the multifaceted targets can be achieved at national level. However, it is not uncommon, these days, to hear unethical leaders and leadership practices in many organizations including higher education institutions. Therefore, the discussion of ethical leadership in the context of Higher education might be viewed from two broad perspectives. On the one hand, the fact that today's Higher education Institutions (HEIs), like many other social organizations, are vulnerable to the adverse effects of the deterioration in leadership and the expectation that HEIs should be role models to ethical behaviors and

practices which makes them to be more concerned on the ethics of their own leadership. To this educational leaders in HEIS are increasingly expected to comply with ethical and moral standards in their relationships and practices (Fullan, cited in Duignan, 2006)

On the other hand, by virtue of their inherent cruciality to the society educational institutions in general and HEIs in particular serve as a training ground and providers of qualified manpower to other social institutions (Ayalew, 1991). For this reason, HEIs leadership is regarded as an inherently valuable activity that sets out to benefit society (Freeman, 1998). On this basis, what HEIs look like in terms of their ethical context could have a repercussions on other social institutions. This is true because "[t]eacher's and school administrators influence how young people make sense of themselves and their world, respond to others, and carry out their roles as citizens, employees, family members, and friends and even as leaders" (Vogel, 2012, p. 2).

In affirming the above notion the Federal Democratic Republic of Ethiopia higher education proclamation clearly indicates that Higher education institutions in Ethiopia are supposed, among other things' to "prepare knowledgeable, skilled, and attitudinally mature graduates in numbers with demand-based proportional balance of fields and disciplines so that the country shall become internationally competitive" (FDRE, 2009; p. 4979) through the enhancement of justice, equity and rule of law in their institutional life. To this end, the issue of ethical leadership and thereby the ethics of educational leaders in these institutions becomes of paramount importance.

Besides, despite the lack of practical guidelines to deal with complex ethical matters, many educational leaders face increasingly demanding and discerning clientele who may challenge the reasons for decisions and the ethical foundations on which they are based (Duignan, 2006). To this end, as far as leaders and HEIs are in charge of dealing with issues of good or bad, or choosing among goods they cannot avoid the agenda of ethics from their leadership process. A question here might be how well can educational leaders survive and grow as they deal with ethical issues? Such growth, demands ethical leaders and such leadership could adopt ideas form other types of leadership that can suit with the unique features of education and educational institutions (Novak, 2002)

Statement of the Problem

Leaders, more than ever, required to be the moral sources of their followers and the organizations they lead (Mihelič, et al., 2010;Duignan, 2006;Monahan, 2012). The need for ethical leadership is being advocated

not only as a cure for ethical failures observed in many organizations, but also for its positive effects in the employees' motivations and performances.

Unethical conducts in universities on the one hand and the merits of ethical leadership towards the effectiveness of the universities on the other hand call for ethical leadership in universities. On the one hand, unethical behaviors that are manifested in the universities in various forms such as student loan scandals, charges of plagiarism, and falsified research, (Hanson, 2009) and the fact that education is basically a moral activity, need universities to introduce change to put the issue of ethics at the center of all their activities. To this end, ethical leadership is not something to be applied as an option (Hermond, 2005-2006), rather it is mandatory. However, despite such a tremendous need for ethical leadership, evidence from the empirical research suggests that the leaders are not as concerned about ethics as perhaps they should be" (Ponnu & Tennakoon, 2009, p. 22).

In Ethiopia, we are witnessing a massive expansion of Higher Education Institutions which has never been within a relatively shorter history of the Ethiopian HEI. The number of public Universities which was just two until 2000 has increased to 35 universities and several private colleges and universities at present.

The FDRE Higher education proclamation clearly stated that Ethiopian public universities should work, among other things, towards the promotion and the maintenance of justice, fairness, and rule of law in institutional life (FDRE, 2009). The intention behind the objective implies that universities should be the ethical models of the students and the community in which they are located. By the notion that universities should be the ethical models of the community implies that, the educational leaders at different positions should be ethical, the decision making process in these universities should also be ethical and finally the organizational culture in which these leaders function and the decision made should be ethical.

Along with such massive expansion of HEIs in Ethiopia, the enrollment in these institutions also rose to 388,529 in all programs by the year 2011/12 (MoE, 2012). It is obvious that several academic programs have been introduced in both undergraduate and post graduate studies. To this, the numbers of academic staff members have been rising at a fastest rate (MoE, 2012). According to Altbach (1999), the more the universities grow; it is hard to maintain traditional forms of governance. Institutions have necessarily become more bureaucratic, and direct faculty control, or even significant faculty participation, has declined (Altbach, 1999). It is in such contexts that ethical leadership which strives to advance the "welfare and quality of life for all is crucial ever" (Komives, Lucas, & McMahon, 2007, p. 19).

Besides, some studies have shown that there are few but critical signal of unethical behaviors manifested in the education sector in general and universities in particular. A World Bank study carried out in diagnosing corruption in Ethiopia, for example, indicated that favoritism and nepotism are among the major, though not necessarily dominant, factors that affect staff upgrading in universities (WB, 2012). As an Ethiopian proverb "Sayikatel Bekitel" that roughly translates into English as "treat before it gets out of hands", the researchers strongly believe that such problems need critical timely treatments in their early stages.

In general, for the above reasons the need for ethical leadership in the universities is apparent. That is, universities should develop a reputation for ethical leadership. To do so, Trevino (cited in Brown & Treviño, 2006) suggests that HEIs "need to be consistent and proactive about incorporating ethics into their leadership agenda" (2006, p. 608). This can be achieved through assessments of their leadership practices and the possible challenges facing in this regard. Despite such concern for ethical leadership, investigations on ethical leadership have been overlooked (Sendjaya cited in Hanson, 2009). As to the knowledge of these researchers there are no adequate studies carried out regarding ethical leadership practices in Ethiopian universities. This study therefore aimed to answer the following basic questions:

1. To what extent do higher education institutions leaders at the western cluster universities of Ethiopia are ethical?
2. Is there significant difference between the teachers and the leaders perceptions of ethical leaders?
3. Do sample public universities differ in terms of leaders' ethics/ethical behavior?

Research Design and Methodology

Descriptive Survey design was used in the study. The major objective is to assess and describe the extent to which the public higher education leaders are practicing leadership ethically. Hence, the descriptive research design fits the purpose of the research.

Research Method

Quantitative research method was employed in this study since as the study involved quantifying the responses of the participants to the questionnaire items and quantitative analysis of the data was carried out.

Sources of Data

Data for this study were collected from three public universities found in the western cluster of Ethiopia. Namely; Asossa University (AU), Mizan Teppi University (MTU), Jimma University (JU). Data were collected from teachers and educational leaders found in the sample universities. The

decision to participate the instructors as a source of data was made based on the assumption that their evaluations of ethical leadership will likely provide the best estimates of department and college level ethical leadership (Brown & Treviño, 2006). And hence the data from these participants were considered to provide a relatively better insight into the organizational level ethical leadership practices.

Samples and Sampling Techniques

In the study multistage sampling technique was used to select the samples. In the western cluster, there were 5 universities. These are Jimma University, Wolega University, Mettu University, Mizan Teppi University and Asossa University. The universities were categorized based on the matrix of their years of establishment as a university and the numbers of academic staff in the universities. The categorization was done to ensure the representation of Universities of different generations in to the study and in turns to examine any variations regarding the ethics of leaders along with their differences. To this the universities were categorized in to three: big and old; young and moderate and small and younger. The categorization was made by adopting the categories made by Kahsay (2012). Hence, from each of the three categories one university was included in the sample by using simple random sampling.

From each of the sample universities, two colleges/ institutes were selected by simple random sampling. From each of the sample colleges/institutions two departments were again selected by simple random sampling.

Regarding the selection of instructors in MTU and AU, since the total numbers of the academic staff members are relatively smaller, participants were randomly selected from the total population of instructors. Whereas in the case of JU, a separate multi-stage in which sample instructors of the study were selected randomly from each of the sample departments due to the relatively larger numbers of instructors.

Regarding the selection of sample deans and department heads, all of the deans and department heads of the sample colleges and departments, which were selected through a multi-stage random sampling in the study were included by availability sampling technique. Since the colleges and departments were selected randomly, the deans and the department heads were believed to represent their respective populations. The data from these participants were considered to provide a relatively better insight into the ethics of the top leaders.

All of the ethical directors of each of the sample universities were included in the study through purposive sampling because they were believed to have better information regarding the ethical behaviors of

educational leaders. In addition, the presidents and the vice presidents of the sample universities were included in the sample through the availability sampling technique.

In general, 130 teachers, 6 college deans, 12 department heads, 3 academic vice presidents, and 3 ethics officers were included in the sample. However, from the total of 154 participants, 132 of them (107 teachers, 6 college deans, 12 department heads, one president, one academic vice president, and two academic quality office directors, three ethical officers) filled the questionnaires. The rest 22 of the samples didn't fill out the questionnaires (see Table 1).

Data Collection Instruments

A self-prepared questionnaire was used to collect data necessary for the study. The development of the questionnaire was based on taking the perceptions of instructors and educational leaders pertaining to the ethics of leaders in the particular study area in to account. The decision in this regard could be attributed to such factors as the researchers' philosophical stand that assumes ethical leadership cannot be perceived similarly across different social and cultural clusters. The researcher's view point, in this regard, loosely corresponds with the constructionists' beliefs of the reality in that humans construct a reality and attach a meaning through various social, economic and political interactions (Hickman & Couto, 2006). Supporting this notion, Treviño and Brown reported that, though such ethical leadership components as character/integrity, altruism, collective motivation and encouragement are universal, the magnitude of emphasis provided to each of the components varied across cultures (Treviño & Brown, 2006). Besides, all the current approaches to ethical leadership progressed from a Western perspective failed to consider viewpoints, principles or values different from theirs (Rhode, 2006). In this regard any attempt of assessing ethical leadership practices should take, its contextual perception, in to consideration. Accordingly serious of semi-structured interviews were carried out with instructors and educational leaders found in Jimma university to obtain their perceptions of the ethics of educational leaders.

Data transferability was also carried out in AU, MTU and MU to accommodate any variations in the perceptions instructors and educational leaders found in these universities pertaining to ethical leaders.

It was hence in line with these notions that the questionnaires were developed for instructors and academic leaders. The questionnaires have no difference in terms of the items or the contents included thereof except the ways of their presentations.

The items in the questionnaires for the educational leaders were stated in a way that the participants could reflect on their own leadership practices

while the teachers were asked to indicate the leadership practices of the educational leaders.

Table 5: Participants by positions

Participants	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent
Teachers	107	81.1	81.1
Department heads	12	9.1	9.1
Deans	6	4.5	4.5
Vice president	1	.8	.8
President	1	.8	.8
Ethics officers	3	2.3	2.3
Teacher	107	81.1	81.1
Other	2	1.5	1.5
Total	132	100.0	100.0

Validity and Reliability

The questionnaires were subjected to the review of professionals of Jimma University. Experts from the fields of educational leadership, teachers' education, measurement and evaluation and English language and information management were also engaged in the review process. The experts have made substantial comments on the clarity of the instructions, wording of the items, the uses of the scales, simplicity and clarity of the languages and the layout of the questionnaires. Accordingly, the content, and face validity of the questionnaires were determined.

Prior to expert review, pilot study was conducted in one of the colleges found in Jimma University and then the reliability coefficient (Cronbach Alpha) of the items were calculated to check the internal consistency of the items in the questionnaire. Accordingly, the reliability coefficient of all the sub scales were found to be highly reliable, where the multi-cultural competence consisted of 3 items (α= .942), models of ethical behavior subscale consisted of 5 items (α=.933 5) the Altruism sub scale consisted of 3 items (α=.945) and finally the equitable and fair, subscale with 4 items (α=.842) also found to be highly reliable.

Methods of Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics such as frequency tables and percentages were used. The Mean and standard deviations of the participants were calculated to measure central tendency as well as the dispersion of the responses of the respondents respectively. Accordingly, the means and standard deviations of the instructors on one hand and Educational leaders on the other hand were independently calculated. The standard error of the means of each of the groups was also calculated. Subsequently, independent sample t-test was computed to test significance variations between perceptions of the educational leaders on one hand and of instructors on the other hand. ANOVA test was carried out to investigate if there were any statistically

significant differences among the perceptions of the participants in the three sample public Universities. The inferences were made by comparing the results of each group of the participants. Finally generalizations were made based on the final results of the study.

Results

In this part, the results of the study will be presented in two sections. While the first presents demographic characteristics of the participants of the study, the second will present results pertaining to the ethics of educational leaders.

Item 1 of the above table shows the sex of the respondents. Overwhelming majority (96.2%) of the participants were males. The females account only a few portions (3.8 %) of the total population. Besides, the majority of the participants (56.1 %) of the study were found out be between 26 to 30 yrs. of age (Table 2, item 2).

*Table 6: **Respondents Characteristics***

Sex	Frequency	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Male	127	96.2	96.2
Female	5	3.8	100.0
Total	132	100.0	
Age			
Below 19 yrs.	2	1.5	1.5
20 to 25 yrs.	20	15.2	16.7
26 to 30 yrs.	74	56.1	72.7
31 to 35 yrs.	13	9.8	82.6
36 to 40 yrs.	13	9.8	92.4
41 and above yrs.	10	7.6	100.0
Total	132	100.0	

Some scholars have strongly argued that there are differences in moral development and moral reasoning between males and females. However, Scholars such as Rest, and Walker disregard the claims of the former scholars ascertaining that the arguments are not based on systematic review of literature on morality (cited in (Brown & Treviño, 2006). Brown & Treviño, (2006), have also reported that after intensive review of literature they couldn't come up with evidences that show any relationship between ethical leadership and demographic characteristics'. They have particularly observed no gender differences in ethical leadership.

Ethical Leaders Characteristics

In this section of the study, those variables constituting ethical leaders' behaviors are presented and analyzed.

Table 7: Summary of the Means and Standard Deviation of Instructors' and Educational leaders Response on the Ethical leader behaviors

Name of university	participants		Equity and fairness	Multi-cultural competence	Models of ethical behavior	Altruism	Total	
							x	SD
JU	EL	X	4.1250	4.2917	4.2250	4.1250	4.19	.53969
		SD	.44320	.62836	.57009	.68863		
	INS	X	3.2892	3.3660	3.3176	3.2288	3.30	.53969
		SD	.89774	.96438	.87469	.95100		
	Total	X	3.4025	3.4915	3.4407	3.3503	3.4213	.85406
		SD	.89541	.97548	.89271	.96574		
AU	EL	X	4.3125	4.4583	4.2250	4.0833	4.2698	.81521
		SD	.62321	.94176	.71264	1.13739		
	INS	X	3.5326	3.6667	3.4957	3.4783	3.5433	.85781
		SD	.87680	.95874	.89009	1.12288		
	Total	X	3.7339	3.8710	3.6839	3.6344	3.7308	.89393
		SD	.88019	1.00251	.89707	1.13970		
MTU	EL	X	4.3889	4.7407	4.4444	4.1481	4.4306	.50153
		SD	.54645	.52116	.45583	.78371		
	INS	X	2.5000	2.8990	2.3758	2.1515	2.4816	.93313
		SD	.89049	1.21759	.99719	1.08682		
	Total	X	2.9048	3.2937	2.8190	2.5794	2.8992	1.17636
		SD	1.13690	1.33983	1.24690	1.31504		
Total	EL	X	4.2800	4.5067	4.3040	4.1200	4.3027	.61093
		SD	.53190	.70789	.56898	.84918		
	INS	X	3.0981	3.2866	3.0654	2.9502	3.1001	.96160
		SD	.97417	1.07618	1.02194	1.15815		
	Total	X	3.3220	3.5177	3.3000	3.1717	3.3278	1.01996
		SD	1.01775	1.12215	1.06849	1.19547		

(Note: ≥ 4.00= Always; X=3 = Sometimes; X ≤ 2= Rarely; X ≤ 1= Never)

Four combined variables are the focuses of emphasis to the section. These are equity and fairness of the leaders, multicultural competence, modeling ethical behaviors and altruism. Each of the combined variables is generated by combining specific items from the questionnaires. Similar items, related to the ethical leaders, were presented for both educational officers and teachers with different way of responding for each of the two groups of the participants. Academic leaders holding different positions were asked to reflect their own ethical behaviors; while the teachers were asked to rate how often their immediate leaders exhibit the identified ethical behaviors.

The grand mean score for all sub variables of ethical leader behavior: equitable and fair *(M= 3.32, SD= 1.01,)* multicultural competence *(M= 3.51, SD= 1.12)* models of ethical behavior *(M= 3.30, SD= 1.06)* and altruisms

(M= 3.37, SD= 1.19) was found out to be average indicating that the leaders in the sample universities were moderately ethical as measured in terms of their equitability and fairness, their multicultural competencies, being models for ethical behaviors and altruistic behaviors (See Table-3)

Table 8: Independent t-test of the perceptions between instructors and educational leaders pertaining to the ethics of leaders.

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
								Lower	Upper
Equal variances assumed	6.721	.011	5.968	130	.000	1.20259	.20151	.80393	1.60125
Equal variances not assumed			7.833	55.608	.000	1.20259	.15353	.89499	1.51019

• The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level./Note: [CI= .95]

Though the ethical behaviors of the educational leaders in the sample universities were generally found out to be moderate, the study identified statistically significant differences, *t (130) = 5.968, p< .001*, (Table 4) between the perceptions of the instructors *(M=3.1, SD= .961)* and educational leaders *(M= 4.32, SD= .610)* (Table: 3) indicating that ethical educational leaders in sample universities were perceived to be less ethical than they perceived themselves.

Analysis of ANOVA was computed to investigate if there were differences in the perceptions of the participants across the three sample universities. Hence, statistically significant differences were identified among the responses of the participants across the three of the four sub variables of ethical leaders' behaviors. The perceptions of the participants in the three universities differed from one another in a statistically significant way on the extent to which the leaders in the universities were equitable and fair , *F (2, 129) = 6.80, p= .002*, models of ethical behavior, *F(2, 129) = 7.43, p= .001*, and altruistic as well, *F(2, 129) =9.148, p=.000.(Table 5)*

Table 9: ANOVA for the perceptions of the participants regarding the sub variables of Ethical leaders' behavior

Leaders' Behavior			Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Equitable And Fair		Between Groups	12.953	2	6.477	6.807	.002
		Within Groups	122.738	129	.951		
		Total	135.691	131			
Multi-Cultural Competence		Between Groups	6.017	2	3.009	2.442	.091
		Within Groups	158.941	129	1.232		
		Total	164.959	131			
Models Of Ethical Behavior		Between Groups	15.451	2	7.725	7.431	.001
		Within Groups	134.109	129	1.040		
		Total	149.560	131			
Altruism		Between Groups	23.255	2	11.627	9.148	.000
		Within Groups	163.964	129	1.271		
		Total	187.219	131			

In order to see where the differences lied across the sample universities, a Tukey's Post Hoc tests were undertaken.

The Tukey's Post Hoc analysis, therefore, shows that there were statistically significant difference between the mean scores of *JU (M= 3.40, SD= .89)* and *AU (M=3.73, SD= .880) on one hand and* MTU *(M= 2.9= 1.13)* on the other hand (See Table-6).

Table 10: Post Hoc Tests for equity and fairness

			Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval	
						Lower Bound	Upper Bound
Equity and Fairness	JU	AU	-.33133	.21638	.280	-.8444	.1817
		MTU	.49778[*]	.19693	.034	.0309	.9647
	AU	JU	.33133	.21638	.280	-.1817	.8444
		MTU	.82911[*]	.23097	.001	.2815	
	MTU	JU	-.49778[*]	.19693	.034	-.9647	-.0309
		AU	-.82911[*]	.23097	.001	-1.3767	-.2815

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level./Note: [CI= .95]

This implies that leaders' at MTU were less equitable and fair than leaders at AU and JU. It is possible to say that the leaders at MTU were found to be less equitable and fair as compared to those leaders in JU and AU, as perceived by the participants.

Table 11: Post Hoc Tests for Models of Ethical Behavior

			Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Interval Lower Bound	Confidence Upper Bound
Models of Ethical behavior	JU	AU	-.24319	.22618	.531	-.7795	.2931
		MTU	.62163*	.20585	.009	.1336	1.1097
	AU	JU	.24319	.22618	.531	-.2931	.7795
		MTU	.86482*	.24143	.001	.2924	1.4373
	MTU	JU	-.62163*	.20585	.009	-1.1097	-.1336
		AU	-.86482*	.24143	.001	-1.4373	-.2924

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

The Post Hoc Test result, in table 7, shows that there were significant statistical differences, *p= .009,* between *JU (M= 3.40, SD= .89)* and MTU *(M= 2.9= 1.13),* and between, *p= .001,* MTU *(M= 2.9= 1.13) and* AU *(M=3.73, SD= .880)* implying that leaders at MTU were perceived as less ethical models than leaders at AU and JU.

Table 12: Post Hoc Tests for Altruisms

			Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.	95% Interval Lower Bound	Confidence Upper Bound
Altruisms	JU	AU	-.28413	.25009	.494	-.8771	.3089
		MTU	.77092*	.22761	.003	.2312	1.3106
	AU	JU	.28413	.25009	.494	-.3089	.8771
		MTU	1.05504*	.26695	.000	.4221	1.6880
	MTU	JU	-.77092*	.22761	.003	-1.3106	-.2312
		AU	-1.05504*	.26695	.000	-1.6880	-.4221

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

The Turkey's post hoc tests, presented in table 8, indicated that leaders in the MTU *(M= 2.9= 1.13)* are considered to be less altruists than leaders at JU *(M= 3.40, SD= .89)*, p = .003, and AU *(M=3.73, SD= .880), p= .000.*

Discussion

The study found out those leaders in the sample universities were perceived moderately ethical: equitable and fair *(M= 3.32, SD= 1.01,)*

multicultural competence *(M= 3.51, SD= 1.12)* models of ethical behavior *(M= 3.30, SD= 1.06)* and altruisms *(M= 3.37, SD= 1.19).*

   The results of this study revealed that leaders in the public universities do not demonstrate ethical behaviors to expected level in the eyes of the teachers *(M=3.1, SD= .961),* while the leaders *(M= 4.32, SD= .610)* perceived themselves more highly ethical than how they are perceived by the teachers, *t (130) = 5.968, p< .001.* According to this study, the leaders at MTU were demonstrated lower multicultural competences, lower altruism, and modeling ethical behavior.

   It was also found to be lower than that of the leaders at AU. Academic leaders perceived themselves as ethical leaders more than the teachers perceived them in light of the extent to which they demonstrated ethical behaviors, *p =.034[CI= .95..*

   In almost all of the ethical leadership variables identified in this study the results have exhibited enormously different positions. How well ethical leaders are? Academic leaders, reported "We are doing well", while the teachers indicated the opposite. The situation demands us to pause for a while and raise a question "was that self-reporting or employee cynicism?" The findings of the study in this regard are in line with the findings of previous studies on leadership practices.

   Research suggests that there are tendencies of self-reporting when leaders are requested to indicate their ethical behaviors as a leader (Brown & Trevino, 2006). In this case, it might be difficult to reach at the clear understanding of ethical leadership practices on the bases of the responses of the leaders alone. The self -reporting could mislead us to the wrong path. Hence, it is better to see from the followers' angle too. But here too things are not straight forward. Researchers have also noted the increasing cynicism of rank and file employees -"a negative attitude toward one's employing organization". From the findings of the study, it is possible to conclude that the teachers and the leaders are perceive ethical leadership from quite different perspectives.

Conclusion

   Based on the major findings of the study the following conclusions are made

   In ethical leadership the ethics of individual leaders possess an utmost significance. In every setting, everyone wants to be fully confident in their leaders, and to be fully confident they have to believe that their leaders are individuals of strong character and solid integrity (Kouzes & Posner, 2007). This is because; psychologically the influence of leaders on their followers involves the motives and perceptions of the followers in relation to the leaders' actions and the situation in which the influence occurs (Yukl, 2010).

According to a social exchange theory, leaders' honesty, trustworthiness, caring and concern for employees and other people, and their fair and principled decision-making yields positive employee attitude, because, "followers should wish to reciprocate the caring and fair treatment they receive and the trust in the relationship, making counterproductive behavior less likely" (Brown & Trevino, 2006, p.607) and the vice versa.

In line with this, most of the teachers in the public universities were considering that their leaders are not ethical in the sense that, they didn't treat them fairly and equitably; hardly considered the diversity in the universities, they were not altruistic and are not ethical models for the teachers. Though, the leaders in the public universities perceived themselves as an ethical, what chiefly matters in the leadership process is the perceptions of the teachers. In the situation where teachers do not perceive their leaders as an ethical, they will not let themselves to be influenced by their leaders. This makes the situation worst for the leaders in carrying out their tasks.

Leaders who are not trusted by their teachers could only end up with a poor performance, or failure if worst came. Like a small wound on one's body caused by the cells of cancer, if a person is not aware of the causes to be a cancer and simply treats the wound alone, the whole body will gradually come to its end or dysfunctional. In this regard, the results of the study signal that there are indications of, if not to say unethical acts, lack of ethical behaviors of the leaders found in the public universities of the western cluster perhaps as perceived by those who were being led-teachers.

Recommendations

Cognizant of the major findings and conclusions of the study, the ethical leadership practices in the public universities of the western cluster needs considerable attention. However, the development ethical leadership is not a one shot activity. It should rather be considered as a series of interrelated activities that are geared towards the creation of ethical leadership in its entirety within an extended time frame work. The other thing to note here is that the problems related to ethical leadership differed across the sample universities and therefore the recommendations may not be applicable equally. But the recommendations were forwarded assuming the extreme cases. Moreover, some of the findings in the study might need further investigations for better explanations. It is in such understanding that, the researchers attempted to forward the following recommendations.

Academic leaders in public universities could be provided with a leadership development opportunities that would enable them to deal with complex university environments. In this regard, universities could estabilish either a cluster based or their own independet leadership development

programs by which leaders at all levels of the universities continually up date their ethical leadership behaviors.

Ethical leadership resource centers could also be estabilished in the public universities, so that leaders and employees could have acceeses to important resources and scientific knowledges of ethical leadership and in turn they might contribute to the development of the field.

References:
Altbach,P.G.(1999). The logic of mass higher education. Tertiary education and management, 107–124.

Auerbach, C. F., & Silverstein, L. B. (2003). *Qualitative data: an introduction to coding and analysi:Qualitative studies in psychology*. New York and London: New York University Press .

Ayalew, S. (1991). *Approaches to educational organization and management.* Addis Ababa: Addis Ababa University Press.

Brown, M. E., & Treviño, L. K. (2006). *Ethical leadership: A review and future directions*. The Leadership Quarterly, pp. 595-616.

Brown, M., Treviño, L., & Harrison, D. (2005). Ethical leadership: A social learning perspective for construct development and testing. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 117-134.

Ciulla, J. B. (2011, 03 26). Ethics and effectiveness: the nature of good leadership. In D. V. Day, & J. Antonakis, *The nature of leadership* (pp. 508-543). California: SAGE Publications, Inc.

Ciulla, J. B., & Forsyth, D. R. (2010, 29 10). *Leadership ethics*. The Sage Handbook of Leadership.

Cohen, L., Manion, L., & Morrison, K. (2007). *Research methods in education* (6 ed.). Abingdon: Taylor & Francis e-Library.

Connerley, M. L. (2005). Leadership in a diverse and multicultural environment: Developing awareness, knowledge, and skills, . Thousand Oaks, California : Sage Publications, Inc.

Copp, D. (2006). Introduction: metaethics and normative ethics. In D. Copp, *The Oxford Handbook of Ethical Theory* (pp. 1-35). New York: Oxford University Press.

Duignan, P. (2006). A call for ethical, authentic leadership. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press .

Duignan, P. (2006). *Educational leadership key challenges and ethical tensions* . New York: Cambridge University Press.

FDRE (2009). Higher education proclamation/ no. 650/2009/Addis Ababa; Negarit Gazette (15thYear No. 64)

Frew, A., Mitiku, B., & Mebratu, T. (2014). Perceptions and practices of ethical leadership in Ethiopian public universities: the western cluster in focus; Unpublished MA Thesis, Jimma University, Jimma.

Gin, A. (1996). *Moral leadership and business ethics*. Ethics and leadership. Academy of Leadership Press.

Hanson, w. R. (2009, may). Ethical leadership in highereducation: evolution of institutional ethics logic. A dissertation presented to the graduate school of clemson university in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree doctor of philosophy educational leadership. Unpublished.

Kahsay, M. N. (2012).   Quality and quality assurance in Ethiopian higher education: critical issues and practical implications. CHEPS/UT: The Netherlands.

Kohlberg, L. (1971). Stages of moral development.

Komives, S. R., Lucas, N., & McMahon, T. R. (2007). *Exploring leadership: for college students who want to make difference* (2nd ed.). San Fransisco: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2003). *Exemplary leadership*. San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons.

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2007). *The leadership challenge* (4th ed.). San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Mihelič, K. K., Lipičnik, B., & Tekavčič, M. (2010). *Ethical leadership*. International Journal of Management & Information Systems, 14(5), 31-42.

MoE. (2015). Education Sector Development Programme V: Program Action Plan (2015/16 - 2019/20). Addis Ababa.

_____. (2015a). Education statistics annual abstract 2006 E.C (2013/2014) . Addis Ababa.

_____. (2012). Education statistics annual abstract 2004 E.C (2011/2012) . Addis Ababa. doi: www.moe.gov.et

Monahan, K. (2012). A review of the literature concerning ethical leadership in organizations . Emerging Leadership Journeys, 5(1), 56-66.

Mullane, S. P. (2009). Ethics and leadership // , Ph.D. White Paper Series. University of Miami .

Novak, J. M. (2002). *Inviting educational leadership fulfilling potential and applying an ethical perspective to the educational process* . London: Pearson Education Limited.

Plummer, J. (Ed.). (2012). World Bank diagnosing corruption in Ethiopia perceptions, realities, and the way forward for key sectors. Washington Dc: World Bank.

Ponnu, C. H., & Tennakoon, G. (2009). The association between ethical leadership and employee outcomes– the Malaysian case. Electronic Journal of Business Ethics and Organization Studies, 14 (1), 21-32

Rhode, D. L. (2006). Introduction: where is the leadership in moral leadership. In D. L. Rhode, *Moral leadership: the theory and practice of power, judgment, and policy* (pp. 1-54). San Francisco: John Wiley & Sons.

Schein, E. H. (2004). *Organizational culture and leadership* (3 ed.). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Sinha, A. K., & Mishra, S. K. (2011, March-August). *Factors affecting ethical decision making in corporate setting*. Purushartha, pp. 136-154.

The Holly Bible: Old And New Testaments: King James. Washington: Rck Cyber Services.

Trevin˜o, L. K., & Nelson, K. A. (2011). *Managing business ethics : straight talk about how to do it right* (5 ed.). John Wiley & Sons.

Treviño, L. K., Brown, M., & Hartman, L. P. (2003). *A qualitative investigation of perceived executive ethical leadership:perceptions from inside and outside the executive suite*. Human Relations 2003, 56(1), 5–37.

Treviño, L. K., Jordan, J., Brown, M. E., & Finkelstein, S. (2011, March 15). *Someone to look up to: executive -follower ethical reasoning and perceptions of ethical leadership.* Journal of Management, 1-24.

Yukl, G., Mahsud, R., Hassan, S., & Prussia, G. E. (2011, December 11). *An improved measure of ethical leadership. Journal of leadership & organizational studies*, 20(1), 38-48.

Yukl, G. (2010). *Leadership in organizations* (7th ed.). New Jersey: Prentice Hall.

Vogel, L. R. (2012, March). Leading with hearts and minds: ethical orientations of educational leadership doctoral students. Values and Ethics in Educational Administration, 10(1), pp. 1-12.