

# Stakeholder Orientation of Ethical Leadership: A Qualitative Study

Pooja Paharia\*

## ABSTRACT

*To date, ethical leadership studies have focused on leader follower relationships for accomplishment of organizational goals. This study, extends research by considering stakeholder perspective of ethical leadership and its importance in context of higher education. The purpose of this paper is to identify the dimensions of stakeholder oriented ethical leadership in universities. The theoretical underpinning for stakeholder-oriented perspective of ethical leaders emerges from stakeholder theory reflecting ethical behaviour of leaders to promote interests of stakeholders. This paper identifies the different stakeholder categories of university and behaviour of ethical leadership for these categories of stakeholders. Descriptive and qualitative exploratory research method fit the purpose of this paper. For this purpose, in depth interviews from 20 informants have been conducted in Central University of Rajasthan. This study combines literature review and data collected from interview to identify themes and subthemes for stakeholders of universities through qualitative analysis. The paper provides tools to education policy makers to effectively manage stakeholders of university through extended views of ethical leaders focused on leader stakeholder relationships.*

**Keywords:** *Ethical Leadership, Stakeholders, Stakeholder Orientation, Higher Education, Universities*

## INTRODUCTION

Field of leadership has been extensively researched to deeply understand the process of influence placed by leader on followers, exhibiting a human relationship (Cuilla, 2011). Recent ethical failures and scandals are being

---

\* Junior Research Fellow-UGC, Department of Management, Central University of Rajasthan, Ajmer, Rajasthan, India. Email: [pooja2013\\_mbaphd@curaj.ac.in](mailto:pooja2013_mbaphd@curaj.ac.in)

observed in every sphere of life, be it business organization, educational institutions or regional organization. These unethical conducts have attracted various scholars and researchers to emphasize the importance of ethics as core of leadership in various sectors (Sinha & Mishra, 2011; Mihelic, 2010). In light of this, Higher Education Institutions are of crucial importance for creating ethical foundation resulting in moral and ethical society, thereby calling for ethical leadership in education sector. According to Brown & Trevino (2005), ethical leadership is defined “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”. To achieve organizational goals and success in stakeholder-oriented society, the notion of ethical leadership limited to leader follower relationship in previous studies, is extended to leader stakeholder relationship. Consequently, this study tries to understand the concept of stakeholder perspective of ethical leadership in HEI (Higher education institution) context. This paper identifies the dimensions used to define the stakeholder perspective of ethical leader and the outcomes achieved by managing stakeholders concern by ethical leaders in higher education sector. The central idea of this paper is to identify the attributes of ethical leaders to manage stakeholders. This study is based on extensive literature review and in depth semi structured interviews 20 informants from Central University of Rajasthan, Ajmer including college deans, department head, associate and assistant professor. The open-ended detailed interview with key informants has provided the attributes of ethical leadership for managing stakeholders. The paper is organized in six sections. First section comprise introduction followed by section two of literature review describing the stakeholder perspective of ethical leadership. Third section is research gap, followed by research method and results & discussion in fourth and fifth section respectively. The sixth section consists of conclusion of the study and last section consists of limitations and future research.

## LITERATURE REVIEW

Leadership is defined as the process of influencing, motivating, inspiring and directing people to achieve organizational goals (Jones & George, 2000). Leadership is a process involving relationship with followers far beyond being only the quality possessed by leader (Kondalkar, 2007).

Leadership essentially is ethical and relational process as it entails authenticity, trustworthiness, honesty, integrity and ethical conduct (Komives et al., 2007). Theoretical underpinnings for stakeholder perspective of ethical leadership emerges from Social learning theory (Bandura & Walders, 1977), stakeholder theory (Freeman, 1984) and utilitarian theory (Bentham & Mill, 1961). After combining the detailed contents from both extensive literature review and in-depth interviews nine dimensions for construct of stakeholder perspective of ethical leadership was determined as shown in Table 1.

### **Stakeholder Perspective of Ethical Leadership**

Ethical leadership theories have been discussed previously in context of leader follower relationship (Brown et al., 2005) escaping the context of ethical leader behaviour toward stakeholders. Recent studies add the concept of stakeholder perspective to ethical leadership where the leader relationship extends to all stakeholders may it be followers, customers, suppliers, contractors, government and society.

Ethical perspective in ethical leadership theory directs the shift from narrow concept of leader follower relationship to broader concept of leader stakeholder relationship. Maak & Pless (2006) argued that within stakeholder society, the leadership responsibility is of crucial importance for building ethically sound relations not only for followers, but for different categories of stakeholders. Stakeholder theory supports the notion of including all relevant stakeholders apart from followers in study of ethical leadership as asserted by Frisch & Huppenbauer (2014).

### **Stakeholder Oriented Ethical Behaviour**

Stakeholder oriented ethical behaviour of leaders includes effective communication. Ethical leader authenticity points towards the disclosure of his intentions and maintaining transparency leading to display of moral behaviour consistent with ethical leader's value (May et al., 2003). Lee & Chang (2011) studied that ethical leaders communicate the ethical standard to follower as well as other stakeholders such as customers resulting in healthy public relationship. Communication of these standard is necessary for followers to earn role clarity for giving high performance (Kalshoven et al., 2011). In absence of this communication, failure in performance of organization is visible as stakeholders are confused about their role expectations (Howitt & McManus, 2012). Ethical leader does not only

communicate but also receive diverge ideas, opinions and suggestions from others (Resick et al., 2011). Effective communication turns out to be a measure for ethical leaders in complicated situation for bringing feasible solutions and organizational change which requires support of relevant stakeholders (Metcalf & Benn, 2013). Podnar & Jancic (2006) also revealed that assessing stakeholder's salience to organization and using resources of communication effectively can bring optimal results.

Cramwinckel et al. (2013) mentioned in his study that ethical leaders are fair enough in rewarding ethical conduct and disciplining unethical conduct. They also concern the matters of others well-being equitably thus escaping favouritism (Kalshoven et al., 2011). Ethical leaders do not sacrifice the interests of stakeholders over the organizational goals, they categorize stakeholders as per the minority (Othman & Abdul Rahman, 2014) and act to protect their rights and well-being. Ethical leaders consider the ethical implications of their actions and decisions on other stakeholders as well (Piccolo et al., 2010).

Brown et al. (2005) studied that ethical leaders are responsible for influencing behaviour of followers and other stakeholders via role modelling. As per Bandura (1986), followers emulate behaviour of their leader by vicarious learning. Role modelling by ethical leaders promotes ethical conduct among stakeholders as they are likely to be emulated by others due to their status within organization. Ethical leaders model and encourage ethical behaviour in subordinates by communicating their standards and using rewards as well as discipline to reinforce appropriate and less appropriate behaviour (Stouten et al., 2015). Ethical leaders are ethically oriented and focused on promoting ethical actions in organizations (Craig & Gustafson, 1998). Since ethical leaders are credible role models, followers pay attention to leaders and emulate them to seek ethical guidance (Trevino, 1986). Kalshoven et al. (2011) Ethical leaders guide followers ethically by communicating importance of ethics and promoting ethical conduct in behaviour of followers. Followers seek guidance in ethical dilemmas they face and in prioritizing their activities (Brown et al., 2005).

Ethical leadership has implications for development of society due to its potential of bringing change within individual as well as organization which is socially acceptable (Raile, 2013; Drydyk, 2014). Studies highlight that ethical leadership causes growth of society having implication for both social (Eisenbeiss et al., 2015) and environmental success (Slaper & Hall, 2011). Ethical leadership is socially conscious since leaders ensures the implications of their actions and decisions on the society

as well as environment (Eisenneiss & Brodbeck, 2014). Ethical leaders meet the stakeholders need by protecting environment and society to achieve sustainability which in turn is beneficial for organization. Shuqin (2014) studied that meeting stakeholders need helps to create stable social environment within which organization can survive, so stakeholder concerns are ultimately beneficial. Ethical leaders consider the common good means integrate the interest of different groups (Trevino et al., 2003). Any decision, actions and process undertaken to achieve those actions by the leader must not harm others, it helps leader in being people oriented. The leader serves the interest of community at the expense of serving his own interests (Fluker, 2002). Also, employees willing aligns to the organizational goals as they know they leaders is concerned for their well-being (Pastoriza & Arino, 2013).

Ethical leader exhibits moderation orientation by maintaining balance between social development and benefits on one hand and the profit goal of organization on the other hand (Cunha et al., 2014). Eisenbeiss (2012) studied moderation orientation attribute of ethical leadership as the modesty, humility and temperance possessed by the leaders. Moderate leaders have self-control on their emotions and personal desires. Sustainability orientation of ethical leaders can be defined broadly in two senses, one in context of long-term success of organization and secondly in context of concern for welfare of environment as well as society (Eisenbeiss, 2012). Ethical leaders take any action only after realising its impact on organizational performance in long run (Den Hartog & De Hoogh, 2008), society as well as natural environment (Ferdig, 2007) and on the future generation needs and interest (Kalshoven et al., 2011).

## **RESEARCH GAPS**

First of all, in previous studies, ethical leadership have been conceptualised and measured in the context of leader follower relationship, completely devoid of concept of stakeholder (Frisch & Huppenbauer, 2014). Donaldson & Preston (1995) defines stakeholder perspective of ethical leadership as the view point of ethical leader to promote, protect the needs, interests and rights of stakeholders. Stakeholders concept has been given due importance as they are the major constituent which can affect the organization (Freeman, 1984). In line with this, stakeholder perspective of ethical leadership focusing leader-stakeholder concept for the overall benefit of the society as well as organization is being researched.

Secondly, most of the theoretical underpinnings for assessing outcomes for ethical leadership based on social exchange theory (Blau, 1964) and social learning theory (Bandura, 1986). Other researchers argue that some other theories can also be considered to explain the mechanisms for ethical leadership output (Ahmad & Zafar, 2018). In support of this, theoretical underpinning for the current research is stakeholder theory (Freeman, 1984).

Thirdly, to date researchers have been inattentive to ethical leadership studies in different organizational contexts (Heres & Lasthuizen, 2010). Most of the empirical studies have been conducted in US business settings (Detert et al., 2007), leaving scope for research in diverse organizations. Fourthly, scanty studies have been conducted for ethical leadership in academics (Englehardt, 2009).

## RESEARCH METHOD

To explore the dimensions of ethical leadership oriented toward stakeholders, this study uses a combination of both descriptive and qualitative research methods. Extensive review of literature was conducted for descriptive research. The search strategy includes keywords examining the literature related to ethics, ethical leadership, stakeholder, stakeholder theory, stakeholder management and related issues in different organizational contexts.

Qualitative study is conducted within the natural environment to understand any process. According to Shank (2002) qualitative research means a planned effort made by a researcher to understand the sense made and observed by others. While Denzin & Lincoln (2000) claimed qualitative research is an attempt to study any phenomena as perceived by people in natural environment conditions. Exploratory research is one of the characteristics of qualitative study deployed in this study as it is useful in studying the topic not having enough former literature and having scanty studies (Neuman and Robson, 2012: 28).

This study is aimed to investigate the concept of stakeholder perspective of ethical leadership among the academicians of Higher Education Institutions. For exploring the concept of ethical leadership in depth exploratory interviews have been conducted (Trevino et al., 2003). Exploratory study of ethical leadership reveals unique information which is not possible by structure questionnaire (Murphy & Enderle, 1995). Interview technique is used to know the opinion, views, thoughts and view

of people for assigning different meanings to a situation. For this purpose, 20 semi structured and qualitative interviews were conducted to gain insight about ethical leadership in higher education sector, stakeholder concept in context of education and the perspectives of ethical leadership toward various stakeholders of institution. This qualitative study is conducted in the natural setting of HEI in Central University of Rajasthan. Through this study data was collected from interviewees and inductively categorised into themes to understand the meaning of stakeholder perspective of ethical leadership.

### Participants

Exploratory in-depth interviews were conducted with 20 academicians in Central University of Rajasthan. It includes 3 college deans, 5 head of department, 2 professors, 6 associate and 4 assistant professors reported in Table 1. The demographic profile of respondents includes age, gender, educational qualification and work experience. Academicians included 11 males and 9 females. 25% of respondents were having age below 30 years, 25% were having age of 41 years and above while 50% were of age group 31-40. Out of 20 participants, 17 were having doctoral degree. 8% participants were having work experience between 5-10 years, 8% participant's work experience above 11 years and rest 4% were having experience below 5 years. The background of participants includes sciences, social sciences, mathematics, english and culture & media branches. The participants were asked questions about stakeholders of institution, stakeholder perspective of ethical leadership. They reported the attributes and qualities of ethical educational leaders catering to needs of institutional stakeholders.

**Table 1: Position of Participants**

Position	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Dean	3	15.0	15.0	15.0
Department Head	5	25.0	25.0	40.0
Professor	2	10.0	10.0	50.0
Associate Professor	4	20.0	20.0	70.0
Assistant Professor	6	30.0	30.0	100.0
Total	20	100.0	100.0	

## Data Collection

Semi structured open-ended questions were used to get ample data from the selected participants. The interview questions were prepared from the extensive study of literature. Overall, 20 sessions of interviews were held each lasting for 25-30 minutes. To decide interview protocol, extensive literature review was conducted and participants were asked following major questions to explore their perception regarding stakeholder perspective of ethical leadership.

Q 1 What do you understand by term stakeholder?

Q 2 Whom do you consider the stakeholders of this institution? Who are most important stakeholder of institute according to you?

Q 3 What are the needs of different stakeholder categories?

Q 4 What characteristics of ethical leadership are crucial for addressing stakeholder's concern?

The responses of participants were noted by the researcher. Ethical consideration was maintained by ensuring confidentiality of the responses of participants and by allotting the number to participants instead of revealing their names. At beginning of interview session, researcher introduced themselves and explained purpose of conducting interview.

The participants (college deans, head of department, professor, associate and assistant professor) were purposefully selected from Central University of Rajasthan, so that researcher can understand the problem and research question as well (Creswell, 2009). According to Patton (2002), purposeful sampling involves determination of appropriate participants for interview, for this interview purpose some criteria is established in advance. Selection criteria of participants was based on their willingness to give interview and their experience of minimum two years in academics. Accordingly, key informants include 3 deans, 5 departmental heads, 2 professors and 5 assistant & 5 associate professors having background of sciences, mathematics and social sciences.

## Data Analysis

Data analysis was done continuously after data collection. The text was divided into category on the basis of contrasting differences and same opinions were kept into same category. In this study two staged qualitative analysis is done. First stage consists of dividing text into various categories and in second stage the categories of text were categorised into themes.

The data collected from semi structured interview was carefully studied to identify relevant items. The repeated ideas within each item were removed and further categorised into themes.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The data collected from 20 key participants is reported in this section. Table 2 summarises the demographic profile of the participants. Further detailed information received from participants has been described in following tables.

For theme of understanding stakeholder concept, subthemes consist of categories of stakeholders for HEI and most important stakeholders of HEI.

**Table 2: Demographic Profile of Participants**

Age	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Below 30	5	25.0	25.0	25.0
31-40	10	50.0	50.0	75.0
41 years & above	5	25.0	25.0	100.0
Total	20	100.0	100.0	
<b>Gender</b>				
Male	11	55.0	55.0	55.0
Female	9	45.0	45.0	100.0
Total	20	100.0	100.0	
<b>Educational Qualification</b>				
Doctoral Degree	17	85.0	85.0	85.0
Master Degree	3	15.0	15.0	100.0
Total	20	100.0	100.0	
<b>Work Experience</b>				
Below 5 years	4	20.0	20.0	20.0
5-10 years	8	40.0	40.0	60.0
11 years & above	8	40.0	40.0	100.0
Total	20	100.0	100.0	

Table 3 highlights the categories of institutional stakeholders as per participant's view, where 95% participants describe students

as stakeholders, 85% participants considered academicians, 25% considered non-academicians, 75% considered local community/society, 40% considered government, 10% respondents considered MHRD and CPWD as stakeholders, 55% considered natural environment and only 5% considered political parties as stakeholders. The understanding of stakeholder's concept identified by participants are certainly in alignment with the stakeholders of HEI as students, senior administrators, employees including faculty and administrative staff, students as customers, society and local communities as special interest groups, other financial and non-financial institutions (Burrows, 1999; Kateshwar, 2008).

**Table 3: Understanding of Stakeholder Concept (Theme)**

Subthemes	
Categories of stakeholders for HEI	Students Academicians Non-academicians Alumini Local community/society Government Research institutions MHRD Political parties CPWD Natural environment
Most important stakeholders	Students Academicians Both student and academician Equally important Natural environment

The concept of stakeholder orientation of ethical leadership behaviour in HEI is depicted in Table 4 describing the characteristics of ethical educational leaders toward different stakeholder categories. For students, academic and non-academic staff as stakeholders, critical attributes of ethical leaders include communication as most important dimension. Other dimension includes fairness, reward & punishment, ethical guidance, role modelling, concern for sustainability, people oriented and moderation oriented. For subtheme of natural environment and society as stakeholders, activities detrimental to meet the concerns are listed in Table 4.

**Table 4: Behaviour of Ethical Leadership Towards Different Stakeholders of HEI (Theme)**

Subtheme	
Towards students, academicians and non-academicians	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Communication</li> <li>Fairness</li> <li>Reward and punishment</li> <li>Ethical guidance</li> <li>Role modelling</li> <li>Concern for sustainability</li> <li>People oriented</li> <li>Moderation oriented</li> </ul>
Towards natural environment	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Stop unnecessary printing</li> <li>Avoid using polythene bags</li> <li>Maximum plantation of trees</li> <li>Awareness for environment</li> <li>Proper disposal of wastage</li> <li>Separate disposal of organic and inorganic waste</li> <li>Saving electricity</li> </ul>
Towards society	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Support charity for local people</li> <li>Providing free education to under privileged students</li> <li>Offering jobs to nearby locals</li> <li>Opening schools within campus for nearby local students</li> </ul>

Ethical leaders are moderately oriented as the needs of stakeholders are successfully prioritized by them in accordance to the importance of stakeholders. Also, to avoid the emergence of conflicting situation of whether to keep organizational goals at priority at the stake of sacrificing stakeholder's interest, such ethical leaders shows moderation-oriented behaviour by taking balanced decisions (Hoenig, 2000). People orientation of ethical leaders is observed in form of participatory decision making, dissemination of information, counselling, coaching and mentoring of others for achieving organizational goals (Khuntia and Suar, 2004). Creation of sustainability is main focus of ethical leaders as they believe in achieving end results without considering profit making (Cuilla, 1998). They give preference to the long-term goals as compared to short term goals by catering to different categories of stakeholders, by ensuring the welfare of society at large as they are ethically aware too (Trevino et al., 2003). Trevino et al. (2003) also studied that ethical leaders takes fair decisions

without any discrimination and favouritism. Therefore, it is observed by exploratory interviews the responses given by participants have similarity to the characteristics of ethical leader specific to stakeholders and not only followers as studied in literature.

Table 5 overall summarise the dimensions of stakeholder perspective of ethical leadership along with exemplary codes as obtained by detailed review and interviews of participants. It includes communication, fairness, ethical guidance, reward and punishment, role modelling, concern for sustainability, concern for society, people orientation and moderation orientation.

**Table 5: Identification of Dimensions of Stakeholder Perspective of Ethical Leadership**

	<b>Examples of Codes</b>
Communication	Listens to stakeholders Maintain transparency Shares information Easily approachable Open and honest communication
Fairness	Using fair procedures while taking decisions Fair in assigning rewards and punishment Do not practice favouritism Do not discriminate on basis of creed Do not criticise others without any good reason
Ethical guidance	Exhibit morally right actions Inspire others to behave in ethical ways Elevate moral awareness of others Enforces code of ethics Support others in making ethical decisions
Reward and punishment	Hold other accountable by using reward and punishment Gives initial warnings in private Disciplines those who violate ethical standards
Role modelling	Engage in ethical behaviour in spite of external pressure Avoid immoral behaviour Demonstrate commitment and trust Walk the talk

	<b>Examples of Codes</b>
Concern for sustainability	Concerned about means rather than end Do not fulfil self-interest at expense of others Consider long term implication of any decision Provide long term values to stakeholders
Concern for society	Do not consider profit making as overarching objective Values social responsibility of organization Concerned about broader society and community
People orientation	Provide empowerment Considers the rights of stakeholders Concerned for well-being of others Protects whistle blowers
Moderation orientation	Willing to admit mistake Tolerance for conflicting viewpoint Possess humility Patient in handling problem

Table 6 describes the demographic profile of all twenty participants summarizing their participants for identification of stakeholders as well as dimensions of stakeholder perspective of ethical leadership. The Table 6 highlights that the common stakeholders identified by respondents are students, teaching and non-teaching staff, society and community where as financial institutions and political parties were identified by Deans, MHRD (Ministry of Human Resource Development) and Alumni were identified by Head of Department (HOD) and Associate Professors. CPWD (Central Public Work Department) as stakeholders were identified by Assistant Professors. This Table also identifies the dimensions of stakeholder orientation of ethical leadership mentioned by participants. Common dimensions identified by participants are communication, ethical guidance, reward and punishment, concern for society while concern for people was identified by Deans, fairness and sustainability was identified by HOD, Moderation orientation was identified by Associate Professors. Table 6 highlights that there was as such no difference in opinions of participants on the basis of demography.

## CONCLUSION

Based on extensive review and in-depth exploratory interviews, it is concluded that the concept of stakeholders is crucial not only for business but from educational institutional perspective also. First of all, research contributes theoretically in introduction of stakeholder orientation concept in context of higher education by ethical academic leaders and exploring the concept of ethical leadership in light of leader-stakeholder relationships. The concern of meeting needs of relevant stakeholders of HEIs is far broader than the marketing and advertising purpose of institutes as it deals with the concern of ethical leader's responsibility to meet the needs of broad range of stakeholder extended from the previous leader follower concept. Identification of relevant stakeholders of HEIs and their management by ethical educational leaders provides opportunity for attaining organizational effectiveness and fulfilling the moral obligation towards relevant stakeholders as part of social responsibility. Secondly, this research introduces a new construct of ethical leadership's stakeholder orientation in higher education institutions and its dimensions explored as communication, fairness, reward and punishment, role modelling, concern for society, concern for sustainability, people orientation and moderation orientation. The survey with 20 key informants helps in identifying the actions of ethical leaders towards different stakeholders of universities. Thirdly, these actions and behaviours of ethical educational leaders are focused on range of stakeholders beginning from students to teaching and administrative staff. This research identifies students as the most important stakeholder of HEIs. This qualitative study instils the concept of stakeholder perspective of ethical educational leaders required to attain mutual benefits for both stakeholders as well as institution.

### Implications of the Study

Education policy makers should continually pay attention to ethical practices of leaders, as it is not one-time concern. Various leadership program and workshops should be organized for different hierarchy of leaders in institution to encourage ethical behaviour for stakeholder in

order to gain legitimacy in society. Educational leaders should provide satisfaction to students, academicians, non-academicians in order to ensure commitment from them for increased performance by building trust with them by using stakeholder-oriented behaviour of ethical leaders. Also, for promotional purposes, along with academic background individual's ethical behaviour and ethical acts should also be considered by leaders of HEI, by devising some feasible tool for judging acts as ethical or unethical. Policy makers should also provide some mechanism and incentives for leaders to think towards stakeholder of universities extending from students, academicians and non-academicians to broader stakeholders as society and environment.

Policy makers can direct ethical leaders to develop a sense of responsible behaviour toward environment by promoting opportunities for non-formal activities to create awareness for environment (Erdogan & Usak, 2009). Thus, HEIs can influence student development and enhance their competence towards sustainable development (Uhawenimana, 2012). Current Student stakeholders will be responsible for ethical decision making in future in business (Jadhav et al., 2014), so HEI takes responsibility to ethically nourish the present as well as future environment conscious generation i.e., students.

### **Limitations and Future Research**

This study is conducted only in one public university thereby limiting the number of informants. The perspective of ethical leaders for stakeholders might vary in private universities. Thus, generalization of result is not applicable in other sectors. Future study can explore the stakeholder perspective of ethical educational leaders in private universities also, leaving Scope for researchers for taking comparative analysis of public and private university. A validated scale can be developed for measuring stakeholder perspective of ethical leadership in HEIs. This stakeholder-oriented construct of ethical leadership can further be extended to other sector as well for future research.

Table 6: Summarization of Perceptions of Respondents on Basis of Demography

Sr. No.	Designation of Participants	Age	Gender	Educational Qualification	Work Experience	Identification of Stakeholders	Identification of Dimensions of Stakeholder Perspective of Ethical Leadership
1	Dean	44	M	Doctoral	12	Students, teaching staff, non-teaching staff, natural environment, society, financial institutions and political parties	Concern for people, ethical guidance, reward & punishment, communication
2	Dean	36	M	Doctoral	10		
3	Dean	41	M	Doctoral	10		
4	HOD	39	F	Doctoral	9	Students, teaching staff, non-teaching staff, natural environment, society and MHRD, alumni	Fairness, concern for society, sustainability, role model for others, communication to all
5	HOD	34	F	Doctoral	8		
6	HOD	45	M	Doctoral	10		
7	HOD	37	M	Doctoral	12		
8	HOD	40	M	Doctoral	10		
9	Professor	43	M	Doctoral	11		
10	Professor	46	M	Doctoral	15		
11	Associate Professor	38	M	Doctoral	7	Students, teaching staff, non-teaching staff, natural environment, society, community, research institutions and parents	Willing to admit mistakes, humility (Moderation orientation), sustainability concern
12	Associate Professor	40	M	Doctoral	6		
13	Associate Professor	36	F	Doctoral	8	Students, teaching staff, non-teaching staff, natural environment, society, community, alumni	Communication, empathy, ethical guidance, role model, concern for society
14	Associate Professor	30	F	Doctoral	8		
15	Associate Professor	30	M	Doctoral	10		
16	Assistant Professor	28	M	Doctoral	3		
17	Assistant Professor	33	M	Masters	4		
18	Assistant Professor	29	F	Doctoral	3		
19	Assistant Professor	35	M	Masters	2		
20	Assistant Professor	28	F	Masters	3		

## REFERENCES

- Bandura, A., & Walters, R. H. (1977). *Social learning theory* (Vol. 1). Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-hall.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Bentham, J., & Mill, J. S. (1961). *The utilitarians: An introduction to the principles of morals and legislation*. Doubleday.
- Brown, M. E., Trevino, 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.
- Burrows, J. (1999). Going beyond labels: A framework for profiling institutional stakeholders. *Contemporary Education*, 70(4), 5-10.
- Ciulla. (2011). 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.
- Craig, S. B., & Gustafson, S. B. (1998). Perceived leader integrity scale: An instrument for assessing employee perceptions of leader integrity. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 9(2), 127-145.
- Cramwinckel, F., Cremer, D., & Dijke, M. (2013). Dirty hands make dirty leaders?! The effects of touching dirty objects on rewarding unethical subordinates as a function of a leader's self-interest. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 115(1), 93-100.
- Ciulla, J. (1998). *Ethics, the heart of leadership*. Westport, CT: Quorum Books.
- Cunha, M., Rego, A., & Vaccaro, A. (2014). Organizations as human communities and internal markets: Searching for duality. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 120(4), 441-455.
- De Hoogh, A. H. B., & Den Hartog, D. N. (2008). Ethical and despotic leadership, relationships with leader's social responsibility, top management effectiveness and subordinates' optimism: A multi-method study. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 19(3), 297-311.
- Strider, S. H. (2013). *Ethical business decision making considering stakeholder interest* (Doctoral dissertation, Walden University).
- Drydyk, J. (2014). Foundational issues: How must global ethics be global? *Journal of Global Ethics*, 10(1), 16-25.
- Eisenbeiss, S. A. (2012). Re-thinking ethical leadership: An inter disciplinary integrative approach. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 23(5), 791-808.

- Eisenbeiss, S., & Brodbeck, F. (2014). Ethical and unethical leadership: A cross-cultural and cross-sectoral analysis. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 122(2), 343-359.
- Eisenbeiss, S., Knippenberg, D., & Fahrbach, C. (2015). Doing well by doing good? Analyzing the relationship between CEO ethical leadership and firm performance. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 128(3), 635-651.
- Englehardt, E. E. (2009). Academic ethics in higher education administration: The dimensions of decisions. In *The Ethical Challenges of Academic Administration* (pp. 13-24). Springer, Dordrecht.
- Erdogan, M., & Uşak, M. (2009). Curricular and extra-curricular activities for developing environmental awareness of young students: A case from Turkey. *Educational Sciences/Odgojne Znanosti*, 11(1), 73-85.
- Ferdig, M. A. (2007). Sustainability leadership: Co-creating a sustainable future. *Journal of Change Management*, 7(1), 25-35.
- Fluker, W., (2002). Roundtable 3: Ethics and leadership. *Conversation on Leadership*.
- Freeman, E. (1984). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*. Boston: Pitman.
- Frisch, C., & Huppenbauer, M. (2014). New insights into ethical leadership: A qualitative investigation of the experiences of executive ethical leaders. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 123(1), 23-43.
- Heres, L., & Lasthuizen, K. (2010, August). Ethical leadership: A variform universal phenomenon. In *Annual Conference of the European Group for Public Administration* (pp. 1-36). Hoenig, C. (2000). Brave hearts. *CIO*, November, 1.
- Howitt, M., & McManus, J. (2012). Stakeholder management: An instrument for decision-making. *Management Services*, 56(3), 29-34.
- Jadhav, A. S., Jadhav, V. V., & Raut, P. D. (2014). Role of higher education institutions in environmental conservation and sustainable Development: A case study of Shivaji University, Maharashtra, India. *Journal of Environment and Earth Science*, 4(5), 30-34.
- Jones, G. R., & George, J. M. (2000). *Essentials of managing organisational behaviour*. Upper Saddle River: Prentice-Hall.
- Jongbloed, B., Enders, J., & Salerno, C. (2007). *Higher education and its communities: Interconnections and interdependencies in higher education*. Looking Forward: Themes on the Changing Relationship between Higher Education and Society. European Science Foundation.

- Detert, J. R., Trevino, L. K., Burris, E. R., & Andiappan, M. (2007). Managerial modes of influence and counter productivity in organizations: A longitudinal business-unit-level investigation. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 92*(4), 993-1005.
- Kalshoven, K., Den Hartog, D. N., & De Hoogh, A. H. (2011). Ethical leadership at work questionnaire (ELW): Development and validation of a multidimensional measure. *The Leadership Quarterly, 22*(1), 51-69.
- Kasetwar, R. B. (2008). Quality in higher education: Role of stakeholders. *University News, 46*(41).
- Khuntia, R., & Suar, D. (2004). A scale to assess ethical leadership of Indian private and public-sector managers. *Journal of Business Ethics, 49*(1), 13-26.
- Komives, S. R., Lucas, N., & McMahon, T. R. (2007). *Exploring leadership: For college students who want to make difference* (2<sup>nd</sup> ed.). San Fransisco: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.
- Kondalkar, V. (2007). *Organizational behavior* (10<sup>th</sup> ed.). New Delhi: New Age International P. Ltd.
- Maak, T., & Pless, N. M. (2006). Responsible leadership in a stakeholder society: A relational perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics, 66*(1), 99-115.
- May, D. R., Chan, A. Y. L., Hodges, T. D., & Avolio, B. J. (2003). Developing the moral component of authentic leadership. *Organizational Dynamics, 32*(3), 247-260.
- Metcalf, L., & Benn, S. (2013). Leadership for sustainability: An evolution of leadership ability. *Journal of Business Ethics, 112*(3), 369-384.
- Mihelic, K. K., Lipicnik, B., & Tekavcic, M. (2010). Ethical leadership. *International Journal of Management & Information Systems, 14*(5), 31-42.
- Murphy, P. E., & Enderle, G. (1995). Managerial ethical leadership: Examples domatter. *Business Ethics Quarterly, 5*(1), 117-128.
- Othman, Z., & Abdul Rahman, R. (2014). Attributes of ethical leadership in leading good governance. *International Journal of Business & Society, 15*(2), 359-372.
- Pastoriza, D., & Arino, M. (2013). Does the ethical leadership of supervisors generate internal social capital?. *Journal of Business Ethics, 118*, 1-12.
- Patton, M. Q. (2002). *Qualitative evaluation and research methods* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Newbury Park: California: Sage.

- Piccolo, R. F., Greenbaum, R., den Hartog, D. D., & Folger, R. (2010). The relationship between ethical leadership and core job characteristics. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 31*(2-3), 259-278.
- Podnar, K., & Jancic, Z. (2006). Towards a categorization of stakeholder groups: An empirical verification of a three-level model. *Journal of Marketing Communications, 12*(4), 297-308.
- Raile, E. D. (2013). Building ethical capital: Perceptions of ethical climate in the public sector. *Public Administration Review, 73*(2), 253-262.
- Sinha, A. K., & Mishra, S. K. (2012). Factors affecting ethical decision making in corporate setting. *Purushartha: A Journal of Management Ethics and Spirituality, 4*(1).
- Slaper, T. F., & Hall, T. J. (2011). The triple bottom line: What is it and how does it work? *Indiana Business Review, 86*(1), 4-8.
- Stouten, J., Van Dijke, M., & De Cremer, D. (2015). Ethical leadership: An overview and future perspectives. *Journal of Personnel Psychology, 11*(1), 1-6.
- Uhawenimana, T. C. (2012). Higher education needs to engage in outreach-based research. *University World News, 26<sup>th</sup> August*.
- Trevino, L. K. (1986). Ethical decision making in organizations: A person-situation interactionist model. *Academy of Management Review, 11*(3), 601-617.
- Trevino, 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, 56*(1), 5-37.