



SCHOOL of  
GRADUATE STUDIES  
EAST TENNESSEE STATE UNIVERSITY

East Tennessee State University  
**Digital Commons @ East  
Tennessee State University**

---

Electronic Theses and Dissertations

Student Works

---

12-2002

# Desired Characteristics of Ethical Leaders in Business, Educational, Political and Religious Organizations from East Tennessee: A Delphi Investigation.

Jeff Moorhouse  
*East Tennessee State University*

Follow this and additional works at: <https://dc.etsu.edu/etd>

 Part of the [Educational Administration and Supervision Commons](#)

---

## Recommended Citation

Moorhouse, Jeff, "Desired Characteristics of Ethical Leaders in Business, Educational, Political and Religious Organizations from East Tennessee: A Delphi Investigation." (2002). *Electronic Theses and Dissertations*. Paper 709. <https://dc.etsu.edu/etd/709>

This Dissertation - Open Access is brought to you for free and open access by the Student Works at Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University. It has been accepted for inclusion in Electronic Theses and Dissertations by an authorized administrator of Digital Commons @ East Tennessee State University. For more information, please contact [digilib@etsu.edu](mailto:digilib@etsu.edu).

Desired Characteristics of Ethical Leaders in Business, Educational, Political, and Religious  
Organizations From East Tennessee: A Delphi Investigation

---

A dissertation

presented to

the Faculty of the Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis

East Tennessee State University

In partial fulfillment

of the requirements for the degree

Doctor of Education in Educational Leadership

---

by

Jeffrey Richard Moorhouse

December 2002

---

Louise MacKay, Chair  
Russell Mays  
Russell West  
Nancy Dishner  
Cecil Blankenship

Keywords: Ethical Leadership, Leadership Characteristics

## ABSTRACT

### Desired Characteristics of Ethical Leaders in Business, Educational, Governmental and Religious Organizations in East Tennessee: A Delphi Study

by

Jeffrey Richard Moorhouse

Leadership is the moving of people towards specified goals. Leaders come in all shapes and sizes. The leadership dynamic of human interaction is one of the most studied and least understood phenomena. More attention is currently being given to the ethics of leadership in light of recent situations involving misconduct in the White House, illegal accounting practices among top corporations, and misuse of power in religious organizations.

In this study, I sought to identify and prioritize characteristics of ethical leadership with the assistance of leaders in four distinct groups; the business, religious, political, and educational communities within a six county area in Upper East Tennessee. The counties represented were: Carter, Greene, Johnson, Unicoi, Sullivan, and Washington. Using the Delphi technique, the characteristics were compiled and prioritized according to relative importance as perceived by members of the Delphi panel. The Delphi technique is essentially a series of questionnaires used to gain consensus on a topic. A panel of leaders in the business, education, political, and religious communities listed and assigned values to the characteristics they believed to be most important in being an ethical leader. Through the use of three rounds of questionnaires, consensus was reached on a prioritized list of ethical characteristics and leadership traits.

The study resulted in the identification of five ethical characteristics and seven leadership characteristics that the panel agreed should be demonstrated by ethical leaders. The study also resulted in the identification of five ethical traits and 16 leadership traits about which the four groups significantly differed in their assignment of values. Tables are provided that indicate the range, mean, and standard deviation that each trait received during the process.

## DEDICATION

This dissertation is dedicated in memory to my uncle, Dr. William Moorhouse, whose death occurred during the time of this project but served as an inspiration to see it to completion. In my youth, his educational position motivated me to attain this degree. I wish that he was able to see the addition of another doctor to the family. His presence will be greatly missed.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Thanks be to my Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ, who has blessed me more than I deserve. He has placed many individuals around me who have had an influence on me during my life and through this project. There is no way that I can acknowledge each of these individuals without missing someone. To those individuals I say thank you for your love and care. There are a few individuals who have stood out to whom I would like to express my gratitude.

I would like to express my deepest appreciation to Dr. Louise MacKay, my committee chairperson. She would not give up on me and on more than one occasion kept me on the path. You have been a part of many of the big changes that took place during my time in this program. I am grateful for your giving of your personal time and keeping track of me even when I was out of town for a year. Your words of motivation and the kindness that you have showed will always be remembered.

For their assistance in the completion of this study, I thank my committee. Each of you has in some way provided words of insight and encouragement that have contributed to the completion of this study. Dr. West, for your personal time in working with me and the statistics of this study while I was in another state, I am extremely grateful.

Thank you goes to my in-laws, Jack and Lena Jo Gardner, who have helped with my growing family during this study. Their contributions and encouragement helped to me complete this project. They have been a model of Christian love to my family and me.

A special thank you goes to my parents, Richard and Virginia Moorhouse. They instilled in me at an early age the value of education and a love for learning new things. The effort they

took to raise me in a Christian home and provide me the many opportunities that I had growing up will always be cherished.

I would also like to acknowledge the deaths of my grandfather Silas Steele and my uncle Tim Steele. They passed during the completion of this project. They have both left an impact that will long be remembered and their spaces in our family that will not be filled.

Lastly, I am eternally grateful to my family. My wife, Carol Grace, and daughters, Grace Ann and Hannah Beth. Carol Grace, from the beginning you encouraged me down this path knowing that there would be sacrifices. You have been patient during deadlines, encouraging during down times, and enthusiastic during milestones. You have been a editor, motivator, and soul lifter. You have followed my through career changes and possible career changes. You did all this while being a wonderful mother and wife. There are not enough words to express all that you have done or enough ways to express my appreciation. I am simply left with an extremely heartfelt thank you and a praise to God for blessing me with you.

Grace Ann and Hannah Beth, I thank you for your patience with me. Your entire lives you have only known me as a student. You have often wondered why I spend all this time reading and at the computer but loved me no matter what. I thank you for your youth and character. I thank you for the joy that you have brought into my life. I hope to someday be the man you perceive me to be.

## CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT .....	2
DEDICATION .....	3
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS .....	4
LIST OF TABLES .....	10
Chapter	
1. INTRODUCTION .....	11
Statement of the Problem .....	12
Research Questions .....	13
Significance of the Study .....	14
Definitions of Terms .....	15
Religious Community .....	15
Business Community .....	15
Government Community .....	15
Education Community .....	15
Delimitations and Limitations of the Study .....	16
Organization of the Study .....	16
2. REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE .....	17
What Are Ethics? .....	17
Ethical Indicators in Society .....	20
Ethical Leadership.....	25

Ethical Relationships in Organizations .....	29
Ethical Decision Making .....	31
Ethical Policy Making .....	34
Summary .....	37
<b>3. METHODS AND PROCEDURES .....</b>	<b>38</b>
Overview .....	38
Research Design .....	38
Panel Selection .....	40
Solicitation for Involvement .....	41
Selection of Business Leaders .....	42
Selection of Political Leaders .....	42
Selection of Ministers .....	42
Selection of Educators .....	43
Instrumentation .....	43
Round One Questionnaire .....	44
Summary .....	45
<b>4. ROUND ONE FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS .....</b>	<b>46</b>
Introduction .....	46
Round One Survey Distribution .....	46
Demographics of Panel .....	47
Response Rate .....	47
Methodology of Content Analysis: Round One Questionnaire .....	48
Round One Findings and Analysis .....	49



Summary .....	53
5. ROUND TWO FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS .....	54
Introduction .....	54
Construction of the Round Two Instrument .....	54
Distribution and Return Rate of the Round Two Instrument .....	55
Methodology for Data Summary .....	56
Round Two Findings and Analysis .....	56
Ethical Characteristics .....	56
Leadership Traits .....	58
Summary .....	60
6. ROUND THREE FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS .....	62
Introduction .....	62
Construction of the Round Three Instrument .....	62
Distribution and Return Rate of the Round Three Instrument .....	63
Methodology for Data Summary .....	64
Round Three Findings and Analysis .....	64
Ethical Characteristics .....	64
Leadership Traits .....	66
Analysis Between Groups .....	68
Ethical Characteristics .....	78
Successful Leadership Traits .....	90
Summary .....	95
7. INTERPRETATION, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS .....	97

Review of the Study .....	97
Research Question One Conclusions .....	98
Research Question Two Conclusions .....	100
Recommendations for Further Research .....	101
REFERENCES .....	104
APPENDICES	
Appendix A: Points of Referrals .....	111
Appendix B: Referral Letter .....	113
Appendix C: Delphi Panel .....	118
Appendix D: Notification Of Informed Consent .....	122
Appendix E: Round One Questionnaire and Instructions .....	124
Appendix F: Round Two Questionnaire and Instructions .....	127
Appendix G: Round Three Questionnaire and Instructions .....	130
VITA .....	134

## LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
1. Identified Characteristics Of Ethical Leaders By Frequency .....	49
2. Identified Characteristics Of Successful Individuals By Frequency .....	51
3. Round 2 Perceptions Of 37 Delphi Members For The Desired Characteristics Of Ethical Leaders .....	56
4. Round 2 Perceptions Of 37 Delphi Members For The Desired Leadership Traits Of Successful Individuals .....	58
5. Round 3 Perceptions Of 36 Delphi Members For The Desired Characteristics Of Ethical Leaders .....	64
6. Round 3 Perceptions Of 36 Delphi Members For The Desired Leadership Traits Of Successful Individuals .....	66
7. Analysis Of Variance (ANOVA) Comparison Of Mean Ratings On The Characteristics Of Ethical Leaders By Organizational Types .....	69
8. Analysis Of Variance (ANOVA) Comparison Of Participant Ratings Of The Leadership Traits Of Successful Individuals, By Occupational Type .....	80

## CHAPTER 1

### INTRODUCTION

The topic of appropriate ethics and values is increasingly part of everyday conversation as people watch television, read the newspaper, and see the ways that ethics have been highlighted by news reports. Numerous incidents of misconduct have appeared in the headlines reporting the misdeeds of those in leadership ranging from government to business. Stories range from our president and his sexual improprieties while on the job to insider trading on the stock market. In 1985 the *Wall Street Journal* published 400 articles reporting illegal or unethical corporate behavior (Srivista, 1988).

Since 1960, the population in the United States has grown by 41%, the gross national product has nearly tripled, and the amount of social spending by all levels of government has increased five times. During this same time period crime has risen more than 500% and illegitimate births have increased more than 400%. There has been a tripling of the percentage of children living in single-parent homes, a threefold increase in teenage suicides, and a doubling of the divorce rate (Bennett, 1994).

The lack of ethical behavior seen in many business organizations seems to be growing among politicians, educators, and consumers (Gaedeke, Kelley, & Tootelian, 1992). Research has indicated that public opinion ratings of honesty and ethical standards in business are on the decline. Even during a time of record prosperity, many Americans believe that something has gone wrong at the core (Bennett, 1999).

### Statement of the Problem

According to Bennett (1999), the nation we live in today is more “violent and vulgar, coarse and cynical, rude and remorseless, deviant and depressed, than the one we once inhabited. People kill other people, and themselves, more easily. Men and women abandon each other, and their children, more readily ”(p.3). The loss of common values in our society has encouraged us to turn away from areas that have traditionally provided structure and dealt with ethics and values to a reliance on mechanisms that contain value-neutral language (West, 1993).

Hopefully, these trends can be reversed by a renewed emphasis on leaders and the values they possess. There needs to be a greater concern for leaders to concentrate on “doing the right thing”, instead of just focusing on “doing things right” (Bennis, 1989; Lashway, 1996). Leaders are responsible for setting the context within which an organization operates and providing the rules and standards for achieving results (Costa, 1998; Coye, 1986). With this in mind, an organization wishing to create an increased ethical or moral climate should start by examining the ethical standards of the leader. Jones (1995) suggested, “The best guarantee of consistent ethical leadership lies in the discovery of persons for whom high moral standards are a way of life” (p. 868). She stated that consistent ethical behavior is the result of a socialization process more thorough than any process than the business sector could provide. When the moment for a hard choice comes, recently memorized principles may be less influential than long standing habits. Thus, the need for finding individuals who have already been exposed to such a socialization process becomes even more important.

Ultimately we judge our leaders from a framework of values. Ethics and leadership go hand in hand. Effective leadership is a consequence of ethical conduct (Hitt, 1990). We rely upon leaders to keep alive values beyond those to which we are bound by our laws (Gardner, 1990).

The ethical conduct that is displayed by those in leadership positions can have a great impact on those who are lead to become more ethical themselves (Hitt, 1990). It could be argued that the nation and its contributing communities are suffering from a lack of appropriate values in their institutions. What is needed is a supply of leaders who are committed to something more than profits and immediate success. Identifying the characteristics of ethical leaders will allow all communities to develop methods for identifying members that fit these criteria. Once individuals have been selected, programs can be developed to address the needs of the constituents that they serve.

Understanding what individuals of our area consider the term ethical to mean and identifying appropriate individuals who meet selected criteria are important tasks. While the rural six county area surrounding East Tennessee State University does not currently suffer from many of the plagues of urban society, it is important that individuals be trained and prepared for leadership positions in local institutions to help ensure the future success of our region.

The purpose of this study was to identify and prioritize characteristics of ethical leaders as defined by a panel of experts representative of educational, business, religious, and governmental organizations. A secondary purpose of the study was to identify the extent of agreement in the ratings of ethical characteristics by the panelists from the four different organizations.

### Research Questions

The following two research questions were used to guide this study:

1. What are the characteristics and traits of ethical leadership as identified by leaders from business, educational, governmental, and religious organizations?

2. Are there differences in the ratings of ethical leadership characteristics and traits based on the type of organization that the leaders represent?

Associated with Research Question Two were the following two general research hypotheses, stated in the null form.

H02<sub>1</sub>: There were no significant differences in the item means of the Ethical Leadership items, based on the respondents' occupational type.

H02<sub>2</sub>: There were no significant differences in the item means of the Leadership Trait items, based on the respondents' occupational type.

#### Significance of the Study

The health of a community or organization depends in part on the values of those in leadership positions. While all leaders are assumed to have skills for the positions in which they serve, not all are prepared to identify the values by which they make decisions and clarify the values in an organization under which others will operate. In order for communities to think above profits and immediate success, leaders must stimulate thinking and be visual models for others to follow. Once characteristics are identified, organizations can develop strategies for selecting and training individuals for key positions.

This study provides important information to business, education, religious, and government leaders in the six county area surrounding East Tennessee State University. The results may be used as one part of the process to identify the most effective candidates for potential job vacancies or to identify individuals in whom more specialized training should be

invested. It may also lead to better clarification as to what is universally meant within local communities when the term “ethical” is used.

### Definitions of Terms

#### Religious Community

The religious community is composed of individuals who are leaders of organizations that serve the spiritual needs of the community in Carter, Greene, Johnson, Unicoi, Sullivan, and Washington Counties.

#### Business Community

The business community is composed of individuals who serve in positions of leadership for organizations that provide goods and services for others in Carter, Greene, Johnson, Unicoi, Sullivan, and Washington Counties.

#### Government Community

The government community is composed of individuals who hold positions of leadership in which they were elected or appointed to serve in the communities of Carter, Greene, Johnson, Unicoi, Sullivan, and Washington Counties.

#### Education Community

The education community is composed of individuals working in positions of leadership in the school systems of Carter, Greene, Johnson, Unicoi, Sullivan, and Washington Counties.



### Delimitations and Limitations of the Study

The following delimitations and limitations are relevant to this study:

1. The members of the Delphi panel were chosen from the four identified communities within a 50-mile radius of East Tennessee State University.
2. The study is limited by the inherent nature of the research tool, the Delphi technique, as implemented in this study. The Delphi technique allows a group of participants to reach a consensus on a central topic but does not allow for the conflicts possible through face-to-face contact (Putnam, Spiegel, & Bruininks, 1995).

### Organization of the Study

The study is organized and sequenced as follows:

Chapter 1 includes the introduction, statement of the problem, research questions, significance of the study, definitions of terms, delimitations of the study, and organization of the study.

Chapter 2 contains the review of related literature and research related to the problem being studied.

Chapter 3 includes a description of the Delphi technique as well as the methodology and procedures used to gather data for the study.

Chapter 4 contains the procedures, results, and findings of Round One.

Chapter 5 contains the procedures, results, and findings of Round Two.

Chapter 6 contains the procedures, results, and findings of Round Three.

Chapter 7 contains a summary of the study and findings, conclusions drawn from the findings, a discussion of the findings, and recommendations for practice and for further study.

## CHAPTER 2

### REVIEW OF THE RELATED LITERATURE

This chapter provides a review of the literature and research related to the study. The review of literature focused on five areas and was organized in the following categories: (1) What are ethics?; (2) Ethical indicators in society; (3) Ethical leadership; (4) Ethical relationships in organizations; and (5) Ethical policymaking and Decision-making.

#### What Are Ethics?

It is difficult to obtain agreement on the meaning of ethics, as there are many individual interpretations. Markkula Center for Applied Ethics (2001) pointed out that many people tend to equate ethics with their feelings, although this does not represent ethics. People have different feelings related to given situations. A person following his/her feelings may recoil from doing right if it requires something unpleasant of them. Ethics should not be identified with religion. While most religions do advocate high ethical standards, ethics are not limited to religious people. Ethical people do not simply follow the laws. Laws can deviate from what is ethical. Apartheid is an example of such a law. Apartheid, clearly an unethical practice, made it legal for individuals to segregate individuals based on race. Ethical people do not necessarily do only what is socially acceptable.

Josephson (2001) suggested that ethics involves two things. First, it involves the ability to discern right from wrong. Second, it includes a commitment to do what is good and proper. Ethical behavior requires action. McKerrow (1997) stated the following:

The emphasis on solving moral dilemmas, analyzing cases and developing moral reasoning, while useful, misses the point. Ethics goes far beyond legal issues (which are often the major concern for administrators) and poses the questions: What is good? What is right? What ought one to do? (p. 218).

McKerrow also suggested that ethics emerge from the recognition that fundamental needs are the same for everyone so that what is good and right must also be the same for everyone at all times. It is suggested that if this logic is not followed through, relativism is promoted. The act of removing a universal moral authority reduces standards to preferences.

It could be argued that this universal moral authority that McKerrow talks about could also be referred to as a value. Rokeach (1973) defined a value as “ an enduring belief that a specific mode of conduct or end state of existence is personally or socially preferable to an opposite or converse mode of conduct or end state of existence” (p.5).

Bird and Waters (1987) suggested that values and moral standards are authoritative guides for interpersonal behavior. They pointed out that such standards could be derived from traditions, religious beliefs, rational argumentation, popular acceptance, and legal enactment. Covey (1991) further described these standards as principles. He added clarification, noting that principles are different from practices. Practices, he pointed out, are activities that work in one situation but not necessarily in another. Principles are universal. When applied properly by individuals, they are empowered to act without the need for constant supervision. He suggested that the difference between leadership and management is distinguished by leadership’s being more closely connected to principles. Watson (1991) described the values of ethical behavior to be the standards of morality that society honors because they have passed the tests of experience in the lives of many productive people.

Josephson (2001) referred to ethics as standards of conduct that tell individuals how they should behave based on moral duties and virtues that are derived from principles of right and wrong. He further distinguished between morals, values, and ethics. Morals describe personal convictions of right and wrong based on religious beliefs, cultural roots, family background, and other contributing factors. Values, according to Josephson, are core beliefs or desires that guide or motivate attitudes and actions. Therefore, the terms “ethics” and “values” are not interchangeable. Ethics refer to how a person behaves in different situations, while values detail the beliefs that decide how a person actually behaves.

In a study conducted at the Institute for Global Ethics (1996), 272 individuals were asked to identify the 5 values from a list of 15 that were most important to them. They found that the value of truth was the most frequent choice. The top three values were truth, compassion, and responsibility. When individuals were asked to pick the most important value, the result was compassion. The research went on to show that there is a small set of core values that is cross-cultural and universal. Lichtman (1998) suggested the eight core ethical values include loyalty, honesty, fairness, caring, respect, tolerance, duty, and moral courage. He suggested that people should use these principles as ground rules for behavior when dealing with others.

Walker (1993) used a survey to answer the question of what people considered the concept of ethics to be and determined that over half of the surveyed participants agreed that the concept of ethics was related to compliance to standards or principles independent of themselves. The remaining participants suggested that ethics related to how individuals behave related to a set of either subjective or objective criteria for right and wrong. Koestenbaum (1991) suggested that ethics means that your organization is differentiated by its values and it is this commitment that makes individuals and companies great. Rae (1995) concurred by suggesting that, while

ethics are important because they give direction to people and societies, it is the moral character that it provides that is still what most people consider essential to being successful. This concept of success was echoed by Jones (1995) when he suggested that the reason individuals choose to do business with the highly ethical person or company is the same reason we buy insurance policies. We are willing to pay a premium in order to reduce uncertainty. Rae added that many of the decisions one makes on a daily basis involve questions of right and wrong. Ethics provide the basis for making consistent decisions. Johns (1995) suggested that ethical behavior might entice more customers, and he also noted that an ethical organization should be able to attract and retain employees for longer periods of time.

#### Ethical Indicators in Society

Bennett (1999) depicted our society as being in a state of ethical decline. He quoted statistics from the 1990s that showed an increase in the divorce rate and the number of births to unwed mothers. According to Bennett, the United States is shown to have the highest rate of sexually transmitted diseases of any industrialized nation (Bennett, p.3), while drug use is up and test scores are down (Bennett, p.3). Bennett also noted that while our population has increased by 48 % since 1960, our violent crime rates have increased by 467 %. Bennett cited a 463 % increase in the numbers of state and federal prisoners (p.4). Barrett and Rowe (1994) supported this sentiment when they stated, “Fundamentally, there’s a perception by most Americans that we are worse off than we were, and our hopes for the future are dim. Gone are the days when we looked to the future and saw the Great American Promise” (p.20).

In a study conducted in 1999, one in six teachers reported having been the victim of violence in or around a school. One in nine teachers answered similar questions five years

earlier (Metropolitan Life Survey of the American Teacher, 1999). Twenty-eight percent of students, 23% of teachers, and 30% of law enforcement officials commented that violence in local public schools would increase (Metropolitan). In a study of teenagers, 30% said they had been offered drugs at school (Partnership Attitude Tracking Study, 1999). Srivista (1988) noted that in 1985, the *Wall Street Journal* published 400 articles reporting illegal or unethical corporate behavior. These reports were not just from small businesses or firms but included the names of such corporations as Ford, EF Hutton, and General Dynamics. The Institute for Global Ethics (1998) cited nine different polls completed in 1997 from organizations like the *Wall Street Journal*, *Gallup*, *CNN*, and *USA Today*. All the polls suggested that citizens of this country believed that America was in a moral decline and that ethics and morality were two of the top issues facing our future.

Barrett and Rowe (1994) cited a survey, released by *Who's Who Among American High School Students*, which revealed that many of the nation's top secondary school pupils get their good grades by cheating. Eighty percent reported that cheating was common at their schools and 78% admitted to doing so themselves (Barrett & Rowe, 1994).

To get a clearer picture of the ethical climate in the work place, Joseph (2000) cited a survey of 1500 United States employees called the National Business Ethics Survey (Joseph). It reported that one in three workers observed behaviors that violated their organizations' ethical standards or the law. Lichtman (1998) reported that 48% of the working population surveyed by the Ethics Officer Association admitted to participating in an unethical or illegal act during the previous year. Of those employees, almost half did not report the misconduct. They did not report the misconduct because they indicated they were afraid of being viewed as troublemakers or snitches. The survey also revealed that one in eight employees reported perceived pressure to

compromise their organizations' ethical standards and of those reported two thirds attributed this pressure to internal sources such as supervisors and top management. Similar findings were reported in a national benchmark study on business ethics completed by Walker Information National Study (2001). Researchers found that 54% of employees reported being pressured to cut corners on ethical matters and only 37% of employees responded being comfortable reporting cases of misconduct. They also reported that in light of the profit motive, 31% of employees cited that ethics may or may not be considered when profits are at stake.

Interestingly, researchers found that the further down the level of management a person looked, the greater the perceptions of the ethical culture appeared to decrease. Current examples of such actions include American Airlines' attempts to keep information regarding the "shoe bomber" away from the public, Enron corporation's failure to protect the companies pension for its employees by inflating the profits it was showing, and the leader of the Tyco corporation's being charged with tax evasion.

Posner and Schmidt's (1987) study of American companies found that supervisors were more than twice as likely as executives to say their organizations were not guided by high ethical standards. Their research also showed that middle and supervisory managers were more likely to compromise personal values to conform to organizational goals than executives. Walker (1995) suggested in his research of educational administrators, that they are seldom trained in ethical competencies while Costa (1998) found in a study of more than 500 managers the vast majority emerged lacking in personal ethical development.

This plight has not only affected the business world. A survey was completed on political campaign conducted by the Institute for Global Ethics (1999). Researchers found Americans to be full of cynicism and distrust. Only 67% of individuals surveyed said they could trust the

government in Washington, DC only some of the time or never. Fifty-seven percent said that most elected officials do not seem to be able to tell right from wrong. Interestingly, when asked the same question of society at large, 55% of the respondents indicated that most people could not tell right from wrong.

West (1993) suggested that the lack of guiding principles needed to guide individual decision-making is a societal reality. He stated the following:

The loss of common purpose and shared values in our society encourages a tendency to turn away from the immeasurable areas which are concerned with values and ethics and to substitute a reliance on the apparently technical and operative mechanisms (p.152).

This view was supported in a study completed by Fenstermaker (1996), in which he duplicated a study of superintendents completed 25 years ago. The superintendents were given a series of dilemmas and then given possible resolutions. He found that after 25 years the same decisions were frequently made. These decisions were in direct conflict with the American Association of School Administrators' Code of Ethics.

Randal and Gibson (1990) reported a similar result. They found that while many studies had been completed on ethical decision-making, most offered no clear definition of ethical behavior or conduct. Delattre and Russell (1993) showed similar findings in schools. They reported finding no consensus on what a genuinely moral standard was and no belief that moral standards are to transcend into individual lives. Bloom (1987) suggested that this condition has resulted from an openness that is prevalent in institutions of higher education today. He points out that this "open" philosophy of education demands no fundamental agreement but is appealing to those from all kinds of life-styles and ideologies. According to this view, there is no enemy other than the person who is not open to everything.



Ryan (1993) blamed the plight in our schools and society in general on the lack of common agreement on moral principles and values. It has been widely suggested that due to the diversity of our population we cannot have agreement on a core set of values. Carter (1996) disagreed with this position, pointing to democracy as his source. He suggested that what makes democracy in America different is its attachment to a set of core democratic values that our institutions of government presume will not be challenged. He stated, “ The objection that Americans cannot agree on values is not only false but dangerous. If the core does not exist we are in trouble because nobody grows up to be good by accident” (p. 237). He further stated, “If we cannot agree on basic truths we will in years to come be unable to resolve the moral crisis threatening our nation” (p. 238).

Etzioni (1996) asked the question, “ Does a society that seeks to reestablish order need new laws and regulations or can it build primarily on re-commitment to values, on people reaffirming values they share in their lives?” (p. xvi). He later pointed out that for a good society to maintain order without drifting into an authoritarian state, as many as 98% of those in the society must abide by shared values. These shared values enhance the ability of a society to formulate specific public policies. Etzioni pointed out that what has diminished shared values in our current culture is the rise in individualism, in which objects from the outside determine our values and victimology, in which society is blamed for our conduct (p.131).

Trautman (2000) pointed out that research repeatedly confirms that most scandals start with one employee’s doing relatively small unethical acts. It continues to grow to whatever level the leadership allows. He suggested that this happens for a variety of reasons, one of which is that leaders do not know how to handle unethical situations. Another reason is that they fear that bringing attention to ethical problems could hurt them personally. Whatever the reason,

Trautman suggested that leaders themselves lie at the core of both the cause and solution to corruption.

### Ethical Leadership

It has been widely held that for an organization to be successful it requires effective leadership. Gardner (1990) suggested that while this may have been true in the past, there must now be more criteria specified in the selection of our leaders. Today what are needed are leaders who work within a framework of values. Barnard (1968) suggested that the endurance of an organization has a strong correlation to the leader's adherence to a moral code. It has been argued that ethics and effective leadership are so closely related as to be inseparable (Butcher, 1987).

The connection between values and leadership is certainly not a new focus of study. Any brief study of history will reveal that values and beliefs always loomed large in the decisions made by great leaders (Sharples, 1984). Sergiovanni (1992) distinguished a leader's actions as being divided into the heart and hand. The heart of leadership, he suggested, has to do with what a person believes, values, and dreams about. It is the heart of leadership that drives the hand, the behaviors and practices, of the leader. The truth of the matter is that all leadership is value-laden. All leaders have an agenda, a series of beliefs and ideas they wish to promote (Gini, 1996). Barnard (1968) pointed out, however, the greatest test of an administrator is not merely conformance to a complex set of values or ideas, it is his/her ability to create those values and ideas for others. Depree (1989) closely followed this line of thought when he suggested that leaders owe their followers a clear statement of the values of the organization and that these values should be broadly understood.

The concept of ethical or moral leadership in practice is difficult to capture because it signifies many different things to different people (Campbell, 1997). Adding to this, Hodgkinson (1991) complained that there is no comprehensive theory dealing with ethics and leadership. He suggested that what is included in the literature is superficial. Others have approached the topic by relating it to transformational leadership (Bennis, 1989; Burns, 1978; Ciulla, 1998; Sergiovanni, 1990a) and agree that ethical leaders do what transformational leaders do. Transformational leaders raise their followers up to higher levels of human conduct and ethical aspiration by focusing on the higher order needs of their followers. In organizations such as schools, a leader is responsible for addressing issues such as equity, freedom, character, and justice. To be able to do this, leaders have to know and be able to model their own values, the values of their community, and the ethical principles guiding action taken as a consequence of holding certain values (Czaja & Lowe, 2000). With this in mind, one can understand how Paquet (1996) once stated that leadership is, first and foremost, a moral issue.

Leadership becomes an ethical and moral issue because leaders have responsibilities. People in positions of leadership can make a difference because they can bring about changes in behavior that would not occur without their presence (Dobel, 1998). The ability to have this influence over others requires the selection of individuals to leadership positions to be examined with great scrutiny. Individuals in leadership positions should be selected based on personal actions and choices that play out over time. These choices build patterns of judgments that identify the morals and ethics of an individual (Calabrese, 1988; Sherman, 1989).

Stout (1986) argued that what makes this difficult for school administrators in particular is that they have been trained in theories of organization that do not prepare them for the responsibility of the school's moral environment. This is an issue that has also been identified in

the writings of Beck (1996). In an effort to overcome such obstacles, it has been shown that aspiring and new administrators are most heavily influenced by their immediate supervisors and by their overall work environments (Brenner & Molander, 1977; Caudron, 1993; Posner & Schmidt, 1984; Schmidt & Posner, 1983). This is important because it shows that school districts can influence how their administrators are morally socialized by articulating clearly what values they desire (Greenfield, 1985). Leadership training institutions are taking a lead by providing training to future leaders in the area of ethics. This is usually done by analyzing case studies and codes of ethics with additional training in philosophy (Beck & Murphy, 1993; Campbell, 1997). Others have suggested that the identification of prioritized values, together with a practiced ability to apply those in daily leadership scenarios, are recognized as a set of essential knowledge and skills for leaders (Creighton, 1999; Fenstermaker, 1996).

Jones (1995) suggested that the best guarantee of consistent ethical leadership probably lies in the discovery of people for whom high moral standards are a way of life. Individuals who hold these strong personal convictions may be prone to require the same behavior of those that work under them. Leaders clarification of their personal values for their subordinates was found by Posner and Schmidt (1993) to provide greater commitment to the organization and better preparation for individuals to make decisions based on principles.

There has been some research into the values and principles that define such leaders. Yates (1996) suggested the virtues of truth, integrity, competence, commitment, and compassion as being necessary for leaders to help sustain a democratic society. Several of these virtues have been cited consistently through research. Frankena (1963), Kouzes and Posner (1993, 1995), and Scaranti (1994) all have identified truth and honesty as two of the primary virtues associated with effective leadership. Honesty and truthfulness are absolutely essential to leadership if

people are going to follow someone willingly. Dreilinger (1998) pointed out that what makes truth and honesty essential is that they build trust in the relationship between the leader and his/her followers. In addition, he pointed out that leaders who are effective at building trust acknowledge reality by surfacing problems and successes early. They effectively manage the gap between what is said and what is done.

Integrity was identified by Frankena (1963), Howell and Avolio (1995), Kotter (1988), Scaranti (1994), Kouzes and Posner (1993), and Carter (1996) as another essential virtue to leadership effectiveness. People expect their leaders to stand for something and have the courage of their convictions. Without adherence to a core set of beliefs a leader is viewed to be inconsistent and thus loses his/her credibility. Commitment is closely related to integrity in the research because it was referenced by a great number of researchers as being necessary to demonstrate consistency in beliefs in the face of difficult situations.

The virtue of compassion is referenced in the writings of Geenleaf (1977), Howell and Avolio (1995), and Scaranti (1994). They refer to individuals' movement to leadership positions through the meeting of needs of those whom they serve. Leaders demonstrate compassion by constantly seeking new constructive ways to serve the needs of their constituents and are genuinely concerned about the welfare of others.

These virtues, collectively, do not appear to be currently demonstrated by some individuals in leadership positions in our society. Kouzes and Posner (1993) referenced a study completed in 1992 in which individuals were asked if they had confidence in the major institutions of our society. Researchers found that public confidence had significantly declined to a point where only 11% of individuals had great confidence in the major companies and only

10% had confidence in government. These numbers reflect the countless articles and news reports of improprieties. Bethel (1999) wrote the following:

Every time we say or do something unethical, we chip away at the foundations of our moral character and the reputation of our organizations. If we are going to make a difference, we must set high ethical examples for others to follow (p.36).

She also suggested that ethical behavior inspires trust, loyalty, and effective leader-follower relationships.

### Ethical Relationships in Organizations

The power that a leader has over his or her followers can best be characterized in a study done by Milgram (1974). Milgram found that 65% of regular blue-collar worker, when faced with an imposing superior, obeyed instructions and would deliver what appeared to be traumatizing electric shocks to an innocent victim in an adjacent room. This study demonstrated that when immoral and unethical individuals reach positions of leadership they could have a dreaded impact upon those who follow and, potentially, upon society.

The reason individuals can be influenced to perform such acts can best be explained through theories on the stages of moral development. It has been suggested that individuals, as they move through life, can move into different levels of reasoning (Crain, 1985). People start at a reasoning level at which they obey because they only do what those in authority tell them and progress through to the end stage where people act on universal moral principles (Crain).

Not all people reach the final stage of moral development. Some individuals may never make it out of the first stage. These individuals, when put into the hands of an unethical leader, could be lead to commit travesties like the ones mentioned above.

This power could, however, have a positive impact when individuals of high moral and ethical standards attain positions of leadership. “Persons with an ethical supervisor are likely to behave ethically,” wrote Lewis (1985, p. 377). Posner and Schmidt (1984) wrote in their report that managers they surveyed believed their ethical behavior was directly dependent upon their supervisors ethical behavior. In a second study they conducted, it was found that of the five primary factors that influenced ethical conduct in an organization, the behavior of the supervisor was ranked first (Schmidt & Posner, 1983). Brenner and Molander (1977) reported findings from a survey they conducted asking individuals what they believed influenced their ethical behavior the most. By a wide margin, the individuals ranked the behavior of supervisors as the most important determining factor. When organizations attain a culture of ethics within their organizations, every person has a shared responsibility to be a moral leader. Driscoll and Hoffman (1997) pointed out that ethical leadership was not reserved only for those individuals at the top, rather it is a quality held by individuals and organizations that were willing to take a stand and talk about ethical values.

Hackworth (1999) stated in an address to a graduating class of seniors that not many people are willing to put their families and their jobs at risk based on principle. The cog that drives them to make such decisions is the CEO, who makes decisions not only within business and legal parameters but also within ethical parameters. These decisions must be made even in the face of the profit line. He suggested that in a time of interconnectedness with other societies, leaders could not profit at the expense of common good and attempt to hide behind cover up tactics. The leader must face the same high standards and consequences for their misdeeds as the worker who behaves unethically if there is to be a “buy in” of the employees to the moral vision of the organization.

Caudron (1993) found that for today's workforce, working for a leader with vision and values means more than dollars as a source of motivation. By articulating the goals of the organization, leaders are able to lift people out of their petty preoccupations. They are able to avoid conflicts that tear organizations apart and unite individuals in the pursuit of objectives worthy of their best efforts (Burns, 1978).

### Ethical Decision Making

People are faced with decisions every day. Greenfield (1991) pointed out that administrators often have to make decisions about what is good or right in particular situations. Beck and Murphy (1993) reported in their study of administrator training institutions that many of the problems facing administrators were either fundamentally ethical in nature or had ethical components.

Gray (1996) asked the question, "Why do good people sometimes make bad ethical choices?" (p.112). She went on to suggest three reasons for which unethical decisions are made are pressure to meet expectations, inability to identify the problem as a moral one, and that the decision will never be found out. Messick and Bazerman (1996) pointed out that unethical business decisions may not have anything to do with a compromise between ethics and profits but from psychological tendencies that foster poor decision making from both a rational and ethical perspective. Russo and Schoemaker (1990) presented a similar conclusion by identifying the 10 most common decision traps that leaders face. Two of the traps relate to the individuals' failure to properly identify the problem and then to make a decision based on assumptions and opinions.



Many administrators perceive themselves to be unprepared to address many of the moral dilemmas that they are facing (Cairns, 1995). In his 1995 study of Montana principals, he found that 68% of those who participated in the study indicated that knowledge of one's personal ethics in relationship to the ethical limits of the organization is either critical or very important to one's success. His study prompted universities to begin to address this need by including practical courses in ethics for school administrators.

This concern for lack of preparation was also expressed by administrators in Beck and Murphy's (1993) study. Several made comments in regard to making ethical decisions by stating that, "School leaders have no professional training in this, but they have to deal with the problems everyday" (p.12) and " Administrators are faced with ethics issues all the time; how to approach them and giving some advanced thought to them will help them cope" (p.12). Other participating administrators consistently made reference to the fact that administration is about making moral choices and the need for training in the art of decision making.

Greenfield (1991) suggested that the major ethical dilemmas that face most administrators are the need to choose between two moral values that each have merit. Crowson (1989) suggested that these dilemmas are grouped into three types:

1. A situation in which an organizational or professional norm provides clear guidance as to what one's decision ought to be, but circumstances surrounding the implementation are a problem.
2. Compliance with a formal organizational rule, policy, or directive conflicts with school-level concerns of students, parents, teachers, or perhaps good pedagogical practice.

3. Decision dilemma is rooted in the individual's concern that actions guided by one personal standard (value) may violate another personal standard (value).

Crowson later concluded that school principals experience an average of one such ethical dilemma each day.

So how does one make an ethical decision? This is a question that has been asked for centuries and has been approached in many different ways. One is through the utilitarian approach, which was developed in the 19<sup>th</sup> century by Jeremy Bentham and John Stuart Mill. This method of decision-making is based on the concept that ethical actions are those that provide the greatest good for the greatest number (Josephson, 2001; Velasquez, Andre, Shanks, & Meyer, 2001).

The second method for making an ethical decision is using the Rights Approach. This approach is rooted in the philosophy of 18<sup>th</sup> century thinker Immanuel Kant and his theory that people have basic rights as human beings. To decide if a decision is ethical one must look to see if the action respects the moral rights of everyone involved. The more serious the violation of individual rights determines how wrongful the action is (Josephson, 2001; Velasquez, et al. 2001)

Fairness and justice is a third approach that derived from the teachings of Aristotle, Jesus, Confucius, and others (Josephson, 2001). This approach is sometimes referred to as the "Golden Rule". The key component to this line of decision-making is to determine the fairness of the action. One needs to ask the question "Does this action show favoritism or discriminate in any way?" in order to determine if the act is ethical (Josephson, 2001; Velasquez, et al, 2001).

The steps suggested to reasoning out a problem appear to have some agreement among authors. The steps and their contributing authors are as follows:

1. Identify the problem- make a list of possible problems and narrow it down. Identify stakeholders in the problem (Josephson, 2001; McDonald, 2001; Miller-Forester & Davis, 1996).
2. Evaluate the problem- evaluate the facts and assumptions involved with the problem. Evaluate the moral and ethical principles in the problem (Josephson, 2001; McDonald, 2001; Miller-Forester & Davis, 1996).
3. Generate potential courses of action- brainstorm as many courses of action as possible (McDonald, 2001; Miller-Forester & Davis, 1996).
4. Decide- after evaluating the information available and pondering the implications of each course of action, make a judgment (Josephson, 2001; Miller-Forester & Davis, 2001).
5. Implement- develop a plan for implementing the decision in ways that maximize the benefits and minimizes the risks (Josephson, 2001; Miller-Forester & Davis, 1996).
6. Monitor and Modify- monitor the effects of decisions and be prepared and willing to revise as needed (Josephson, 2001; McDonald, 2001).

### Ethical Policy Making

Extensive writing has been done expressing that one of the greatest responsibilities of a leader is the setting of policy for others to follow (Bennis & Nanus, 1985; Costa, 1998; Coye, 1986; Johns, 1995). Such policies are responsible for setting the moral tone within which the

organization will operate. The stance of the leader is the prevailing force in determining the moral health of the organization and whether the policies produced are ethical or unethical (Hudson, 1997; Kelly, 1990). Lashway (1996) pointed out that a leader's moral duty not only expresses itself in the obvious day-to-day ethical dilemmas but in the mundane policies that sometimes have hidden implications. Merely avoiding illegal or improper actions may meet the law but those individuals and organizations known for their integrity live to reach higher standards (Watson, 1991).

Flynn (1995) pointed out that we are living in a time of corporate downsizing and now have employees who are empowered to make decisions independently that can have a tremendous effect on an organization. As organizations forfeit control, they must make sure that employees' reactions to stressful situations are to always act ethically, even when no one is looking. Flynn suggested that often the unethical decisions made by individuals in the workforce are not done deliberately but rather as a result of ignorance. He suggested that an employee code of ethics is pivotal in the move to worker empowerment. Clearly stating the parameters within which an individual can work provides several distinct advantages. One advantage is that they are more productive and less stressed about their work environment. The organization has a reputation of being ethical and that breeds or encourages commitment.

In their research of various companies, Peters and Waterman (1982) found the best performers to have had a well-defined set of beliefs. Providing a Code of Ethics is one example of organizations' attempts to improve the climate for individuals to behave in an ethical manner (Shaw & Barry, 1995). Ford and Richardson (1994) supported this idea by showing in their review of literature that the existence of corporate codes of conduct positively impacts an individuals ethical beliefs, decisions, and behaviors. Posner and Schmidt (1987) found that by

setting policies and clarifying values for the organization, managers who have to make judgment calls do so more consistently and with more assurance. Adams, Tashian, and Shore (2001) pointed out that codes of ethics are managerial and legal tools. Because corporations can be held legally responsible for the actions of employees, managers enact codes to guide individual behavior to protect the corporation from illegal and unethical behavior. Fandray (2000) suggested an added benefit to the ethical organization is that it is more profitable. He cited a study that showed companies that rate their organization high in honesty and integrity had a total return to share holders of 101 % averaged over 3 years as compared to 69 % for companies that were not rated as highly.

Hitt (1990) and O'Reilly (1989) both suggested that for policies to be accepted they must be modeled. They point out that individuals want to know what is important and one way of doing this is to carefully watch those above them. People are looking for consistency between what is said and how policies are practiced. Sadly, most leaders are not trained for situations such as this. Marshall (1992) pointed out that most administrator training programs spend the majority of their time teaching individuals the technical, social, and conceptual dimensions of administration. What is usually left out of these programs is training in how to deal with the questions of values.

This gives the identification of the proper leader increased importance because to ensure that a policy or standard is ethical, the leadership must be ethical (Tong, 1986). Jones (1995) suggests that it is more efficient for companies to find individuals who consistently demonstrate ethical behavior because these individuals possess a value system that has been developed over years and cannot be duplicated by a company-training program. Organizations must take the time to find individuals who are willing to deal with the issues of doing the right thing rather than

merely doing things right. The search is worth the effort because, as Johns (1995) pointed out, it is in a company's self interest to be ethical. It can give it a competitive edge over unethical organizations and prevent the consequences of improprieties. I believe Peters and Waterman (1982) were correct when they asserted, "The real role of leadership is to manage the values of an organization".

### Summary

The review of related literature consisted of five general areas relevant to the study of ethical leadership: What is ethics, ethical indicators in society, ethical leadership, ethical relationship in organizations, and ethical policy-making. A review of the literature revealed the need for ethical leaders in our society today and some ways that ethical leaders impact the organizations that they lead. Values, goals, and role models were essential to the effectiveness, efficiency, and ethical culture of organizations according to the literature. The leader was the key element in setting the tone in each of these areas for the organization. Because of their potential impact on institutions, it is imperative that future leaders be identified and trained for the responsibilities, in terms of ethical decision-making, they will face.

## CHAPTER 3

### METHODS AND PROCEDURES

#### Overview

The purpose of this chapter is to describe the research design. The Delphi technique is explained. The strengths and usefulness of the technique in studies like this are detailed. The process by which the Delphi panel members were identified and selected is described as well as the techniques used in forming the instrumentation.

#### Research Design

The Delphi Technique was used in this study to identify characteristics of ethical leaders in business, education, governmental, and religious organizations. As part of the Delphi Process, a constant sum scale was used to prioritize and give value to each of the leadership traits and characteristics.

In general, the Delphi Process calls for the use of an expert panel of leaders who offer their opinions about a complicated topic and ultimately reach consensus through subsequent iterations of a survey (Delbecq, Van de Ven, & Gustafson, 1975). Linstone and Turoff (1975) described the Delphi Technique as a method for “structuring a group communication process so that the process is effective in allowing a group of individuals, as a whole, to deal with a complex problem” (p.3). The information that is derived on a topic from using such a technique is more up to date than doing a literature search because it is drawing on the knowledge of experts (Delbecq et al).

Four important steps were identified by Linstone and Turoff (1975) to ensure that the Delphi Technique is successful:

1. A method that allows for the exploration of the subject where each individual contributes information.
2. Provisions must be made for reaching an understanding for how the group feels.
3. An opportunity must be provided for individuals to revise their views.
4. A degree of anonymity must be created for the individual responses (p.3).

The typical process used in employing the Delphi Technique is to solicit the opinions of experts in a given field and process them through several rounds of structured mail surveys (Putnam et al., 1995). The researcher identifies a panel of stakeholders who are contacted by mail and asked to give their “expert” opinion to an open-ended question. The responses of the panel are collected, categorized, and combined, if appropriate, and then returned to panel members for ranking or annotation. Second round results are then analyzed. In some cases a third round is required. After the final round, conclusions are drawn and recommendations made. The lack of face-to-face encounters encourages the contribution of diverse opinions and eliminates the possibility that some people will dominate discussions and decisions (Putnam et al.).

The appropriateness of using the Delphi Technique was derived from the six criteria by Linstone and Turoff (1975) who suggested using the Delphi technique:

1. When the problem does not lend itself to precise analytical techniques but can benefit from subjective judgments on a collective basis.
2. When the individuals needed to contribute to the examination represent diverse backgrounds with respect to experience or expertise.



3. When more individuals are needed than can effectively interact in a face-to-face exchange.
4. When the time and cost make group meetings unfeasible.
5. When disagreements are so severe or politically unpalatable that the communication process must be refereed and/or anonymity assured.
6. When the heterogeneity of the participants must be preserved to assure validity of the results, i.e., avoidance of domination by quantity or by strength of personality (p.4).

This study met five of the six criteria listed above. The one criterion that was not met was in regard to disagreements being so severe or politically unpalatable that the communication process must be refereed and/or anonymity assured.

#### Panel Selection

The Delphi Technique is recognized for its use of a panel of individuals who serve as experts. These people are selected based on their willingness to serve and their ability to provide relevant information (Putnam et al., 1995). Panelists for this study were selected from four primary organizations; business, government, education, and religion. Research suggests that while there are varying numbers of panelists in reported Delphi studies it is agreed that if a group gets more than 50 participants the numbers become unmanageable (Cyphert & Gant, 1971). Delbecq et al. (1975) suggested that when numbers get above 30, few new ideas are generated. With this information in mind and to keep the numbers even for each group and still have a good representation, it was determined that 48 panelists would be selected to participate in this study, with 12 members in each identified area.

To ensure that each panel was representative of the population of the six counties, the First Tennessee Development District was contacted during June 2001 to get the population statistics from each of the six counties. At the time the panel was assembled, Carter County had 56,742 residents, Greene County had 62,909 residents, Johnson County had 17,499 residents, Unicoi County had 17,667 residents, Sullivan County had 153,048 residents, and Washington County had 107,198 residents. Based upon the percentage that each county constituted in the total population, it was determined that Johnson and Unicoi Counties would contribute one delegate each to the four areas being studied; Carter and Greene Counties would contribute two delegates each to the four areas; and Washington and Sullivan Counties would each contribute three delegates to each of the four areas.

According to Gordon (1992), "The key to a successful Delphi lies in the selection of the participants" (p. 28). To ensure that quality participants were part of this study, participants were selected using the four qualities suggested by Delbecq et al. (1975, p. 87). In order to be effective panelists should:

1. Have pertinent information to contribute;
2. Feel personally involved in the problem being investigated;
3. Be motivated to take time to complete the study;
4. Feel that the judgments of a respondent panel will include information which they would value and to which they would not otherwise have access.

#### Solicitation for Involvement

A pool of names was developed from the six county area of Upper East Tennessee, which consists of Carter, Greene, Johnson, Unicoi, Sullivan, and Washington Counties, using the

following methods. A list of the individuals who made the referrals can be found in Appendix A. The letter that was sent to each point of referral is found in Appendix B.

#### Selection of Business Leaders

A list of business leaders' names was formed by contacting the directors of the Chamber of Commerce from the six county areas by phone and asking them to complete a form that would be mailed to them for names of individuals who would possibly fit the criteria that had been previously established. These referrals were contacted by phone and given a description of the study and what would be expected of them. They were then asked if they would be willing to serve on the panel. Phone calls were continued until the required number from each county and a total of 12 panelists in each area were obtained.

#### Selection of Political Leaders

A list of political leaders' names was formed in a similar manner. County Executives from each of the six counties selected for the study were contacted. These individuals were contacted in the same manner as described above and then were asked to help provide a list of names of individuals who could be possible participants. Phone calls were made to the referred individuals in the same manner as described above and continued until 12 of the nominated political leaders had been secured.

#### Selection of Ministers

Contacting Emmanuel School of Religion and asking for a contact person in each of the six participating counties generated a list of ministers' names. These individuals in each of the

six counties were briefed on the project, as were previous groups. They were asked to provide a list of potential area ministers who would fit the criteria for participation in the project. Phone calls were made to the individuals who were referred in the same manner as described above and continued until 12 of the nominated religious leaders agreed to participate in the study.

### Selection of Educators

A list of educators' names was generated in much the same way. Directors of schools in each of the six participating counties were contacted by phone. These individuals were briefed on the study and were asked to provide names of individuals in leadership positions within their school systems who would fit the criteria for participating in the study. Those individuals were contacted by phone and information given to them about the project in the same manner as the other groups. This continued until 12 of the nominated educational leaders agreed to participate in the study. The names of the members of the Delphi panel that was assembled through this process can be found in Appendix C.

### Instrumentation

Delbecq et al. (1975) stated that the, "Delphi is essentially a series of questionnaires. The initial questionnaire asks individuals to respond to a broad question. (Delphi questions might focus upon problems, objectives, solutions, or forecasts.) Each subsequent questionnaire is built upon responses to the preceding questionnaire" (p. 83).

Each member of the Delphi panel was contacted personally to give him/her an overall idea of the study. This was followed with a letter informing them in more detail the rationale of the study and requesting their informed consent. This letter can be found in Appendix D. The

first questionnaire was open ended to allow the panel the ability to provide as much detail in describing the ethical and leadership traits they identified with an ethical leader. These were two brief statements centered on ethical traits and leadership traits that the panelist were asked to answer.

The researcher attempted to separate ethical leadership into two components, the ethical traits of a successful person and the leadership traits of a successful person. The reason for the two categories is that a person could be an ethical person but not be a leader. Likewise, a person could be a successful leader and not be considered ethical.

### Round One Questionnaire

Round One consisted of a questionnaire. A copy of the Round One Instrument is included in Appendix E. This questionnaire, with a cover letter, was sent out during the first week of April with a deadline of 10 days specified for response and return. The participants were asked to respond to each of the following questions:

Picture in your mind a person whom you believe to be an ethical leader and describe for me below:

1. What are the characteristics and traits that make this person an ethical leader?
2. What are the leadership qualities that make this person successful?

A cover letter expressing appreciation for the participants' time and input, an explanation that they would receive a copy of the results of the study, and instructions for completion accompanied each questionnaire. Participants were asked to answer the questions as fully as possible, providing reasons for their selections. The data were analyzed and used to develop the questionnaire for the second round. In Round Two, participants were asked to use a constant

sum scale and assign value to the responses that were given in Round One. In Round Three, participants were asked to view the mean scores assigned to the traits in Round Two and choose to either keep it the values the same or assign another value to the trait.

### Summary

Chapter 3 specifies the methods employed in this research. A description of the Delphi Technique, panel selection, instrumentation was provided. Chapter 4 of this research includes an explanation in further detail the review and analysis of the Round One questionnaire and the development of the Round Two questionnaire. Chapter 5 of this research includes the review and analysis of the Round Two questionnaire. Chapter 6 of this research includes the review and analysis of the Round Three questionnaire. Chapter 7 includes conclusions and recommendations for practice and for further study based on the results of this research.

## CHAPTER 4

### ROUND ONE FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

#### Introduction

Chapter 4 contains a summary and analysis of the findings of the survey that made up Round One of the Delphi process used in this study. Included in the findings is information regarding the demographics of the panelists, response rates, methods of distribution, how the responses were analyzed, and a brief chapter summary.

#### Round One Survey Distribution

The selection of the Delphi panel was made using the processes described in Chapter 3. During the first week of December 2001 after an initial phone conversation describing the study, referral forms were sent to Directors of School Systems, Directors of the Chambers of Commerce, the President of Emmanuel School of Religion, and County Executives of the six counties participating in this study. Those individuals are listed in Appendix A. A copy of the letters and referral form that was sent to these individuals can be found in Appendix B. Referrals were returned during the second week of December 2001.

Beginning February 18, 2002, individuals representing the four survey groups in each of the six counties were contacted by phone until the specified representative number was secured. A list of the members that made up the Delphi panel appears in Appendix C. Through these phone conversations, the panelists also gave their preferred method of correspondence as either surface mail or e-mail. The specified number of 48 panelists was secured on March 22, 2002. As some participants favored surface mail rather than email, both methods were used according

to the panelist's indication of preference. Each was sent a packet containing a cover letter, instructions for the survey, Round One instrument, and a stamped self-addressed envelope. The packets were mailed or e-mailed on April 1, 2002, with the Round One instrument to be returned on April 8, 2002. Round One survey materials are included in Appendix E.

### Demographics of Panel

The 48 panelists represented leaders in the areas of politics, education, business, and religion of the six county area of upper east Tennessee. While information about gender, age, and race were not of a concern for panel selection, 28 of the panelists were male and 20 were female. Two female panelists dropped out during the first round and were not replaced. The panelists were from the political and business communities. The remaining number of 46 panelists was determined by the researchers chair and statistical committee member to be sufficient to finish the study.

### Response Rate

The deadline for Round One questionnaires had been set for April 8, 2002. At that time, only 20 of 48 had been returned. The number increased to 28 responses by April 11, 2002. E-mails and letters were sent out on April 15, 2002, to the remaining respondents requesting their questionnaires. This effort garnished three more responses pushing the total to 31. After discussing this total with my dissertation chairperson and with the committee person in charge of research, it was determined that more responses were yet needed. Meanwhile, on April 16, 2002, e-mails and letters were sent to participants who had completed Round One explaining the need to wait until a sufficient response rate had been achieved before continuing with Round Two.



On April 19, 2002, the researcher telephoned remaining participants requesting their return of the Round One questionnaire. This resulted in two participants' requesting that they withdraw from the study due to a lack of time to commit to the project. Other respondents said that they would quickly return their responses. If no one was available to speak on the phone, a message was left detailing the request. The responses reached a total of 38 on April 26, 2002, giving a response rate of 83%.

#### Methodology of Content Analysis: Round One Questionnaire

The Round One questionnaire required that participants provide descriptive answers to two questions. The time required to complete the questionnaire was up to the individuals' commitment to providing answers that were rich in description and full of details. The researcher anticipated that the time required to complete the two questions would not exceed 20 minutes.

The questionnaires were read by the researcher one at a time and notes were made listing the characteristics detailed in each response. This process was followed for both questions. The responses were then analyzed and, when appropriate, grouped together into common categories. All characteristics that were recommended were considered equal and provided the basis of the questionnaire generated for Round Two. The process resulted in 50 ethical categories and 60 leadership categories.

The content of the descriptions varied. Most simply listed characteristics. Others, however, provided more descriptive information as well as the rationale for their responses. Considering the number of responses given, the researcher concluded that the topic had been

sufficiently covered and that consensus could later be reached by members of the panel as to the relative importance of the characteristics.

### Round One Findings and Analysis

The data supplied by the panelists were analyzed by question and organized into lists to assist in ease of accessing the information. All of the characteristics suggested by the panelists are contained in the following list. Items only had to be mentioned one time to be included for consideration. The individual contributions of the panelists have not been included because confidentiality was promised. The lists are a presentation of their collective responses.

Question #1: Picture in your mind a person that you believe to be an ethical leader and describe for me below: What are the characteristics and traits that make this person an ethical leader?

Panelists provided many characteristics that they indicated to be important and those responses are contained in Table 1:

Table 1  
Identified Characteristics Of Ethical Leaders By Frequency

Characteristic	f
Logical	3
Energetic	2
Resourceful	3
Attune to the changing needs of others	3
Honest	21
Dependable	11
Maintains confidentiality	2
Fair/Unbiased	5
Consistent	8
Tactful	3
Good listener	4

Table 1 Continued

Characteristic	f
Delegates authority/Lets others lead	2
Priorities greater than work	2
Creates a safe working environment	1
Empathetic/Sympathetic	2
Strong character	6
Mature	2
Wise/Common Sense	3
Risk taker	1
Persistent	2
Goes the extra mile	1
Integrity	10
Does things in a timely manner	1
Strives to serve	2
Obeys the rules	2
Goal oriented	1
Follows biblical principles of behavior	6
Makes decisions and sticks by them	3
Publicly recognizes the works of others	1
High moral standards/Firm convictions	10
Courage in decision making	4
Selfless/Puts others first	7
Loyal	3
Straightforward	3
Free from prejudice	3
Compassionate/Caring	8
Volunteers in community	1
Courteous	3
Diplomatic	1
Knows right from wrong	5
Diligent	4
Authentic	3
Courageous	3
Introspective/Reflective thinker	3
Defends those less fortunate	4
Passionate	1
Lacks duplicity	2
Patient	2
Disciplined	4
Continually learning	2

Question # 2: Picture in your mind a person that you believe to be an ethical leader and describe for me below: What are the leadership qualities that make this person successful?

The panelist's responses have been summarized in the following table:

Table 2  
Identified Characteristics Of Successful Individuals By Frequency

Characteristic	f
Weighs options before making a decision	4
Reputation of past leadership	3
Prioritizes goals based on needs	3
Involves others in decisions	8
Develops an atmosphere of trust	3
Good communicator/Articulate	7
Expertise in the field	2
Keeps current with research	3
Organized	2
Well-rounded	3
Leads by example	9
Seeks first to understand/ Asks questions	4
Practices the golden rule	3
Sense of humor	2
Adaptable/Anticipates trends	4
Genuine	5
Loyal	2
Diligent	5
Able to relax	1
Tactful	2
Thoughtful	2
Competent	2
Predictable	4
Strong work ethic	2
Cooperative	2
Delegates authority	2
Empathetic/Sympathetic	2
Task oriented	2
Optimistic	3
Calm under stress	2
Punctual	2
Perseveres	4
Patient	1
Courageous	4

---

Table 2 Continued

Characteristic	f
Thorough	2
Accessible	3
Knowledge of organization	3
Publicly recognizes work of others	5
Foster growth in others/ Mentors	6
Good judgment/Decision maker	6
Self Motivated	3
Wise/Prudent	3
Focused	3
Forgiving	2
Accepts criticism	2
Puts others first	6
Financially savvy	1
Hires the best people possible	2
Creates a vision for other to follow	10
Competitive spirit	1
Seeks new ways of doing things	3
Practical	2
Accepts responsibility	3
Mentally tough	1
Humble	2
Respectful	5
Honest/Truthful	12
Obedient	1
Motivator	5
Team builder	2

---

The characteristics listed in the previous tables reflect what leaders in their particular groups believed to be important to be an ethical person and a successful individual. Many of the responses reflect those found in research. The ethical traits of loyalty, honesty, fairness, caring, respect, and moral courage are some of the same characteristics that were identified earlier by Lictman (1998). What is interesting to note is that many of the traits that are listed in the two tables appear to be closely related if not duplicated, one such example is the trait of honesty.

## Summary

This chapter contains the responses to the Round One survey as well as information regarding the demographic characteristics of the Delphi panel and the response rate from Round One. The chapter also contains a discussion of the methods used to analyze the data. The responses were grouped into lists. These lists were then used to develop the instrument used in Round Two.

## CHAPTER 5

### ROUND TWO FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

#### Introduction

This chapter includes a description of the procedures used to construct and distribute the instrument and perform analysis on the resulting data. Chapter 5 also contains a presentation of the survey results from Round Two.

#### Construction of the Round Two Instrument

The list of characteristics formed by the content analysis of the narrative responses to the Round One questionnaire formed the basis of the content for the Round Two questionnaire. One purpose of Round Two was to prioritize the characteristics that were listed based on the values that were given to them. The other purpose of Round Two was to determine how much each characteristic was valued over the other. In order to accomplish this task, the researcher organized two lists for panelists to evaluate.

The characteristics and traits that formed the Round Two instrument were generated from the information provided by the panelists in Round One. Each trait/characteristic was considered to have equal value. Traits/characteristics only had to be mentioned one time by a panelist to be included in the list for consideration. The lists found in Chapter 4 include all comments that were made by panelists. The first list was that of 50 ethical traits that were generated from the comments provided by the panelists in Round One. The second list included the 60 leadership traits identified by the panelists in Round One. The lists were not organized into any particular

order. The second round questionnaire and the cover letter used in the study are found in Appendix E.

The second round questionnaire employed a constant sum scale to determine the priority of the characteristics and determine the degree to which each was valued. The panelists were asked to take a sum of 50 points for question one and 60 points for question two to assign weight to the characteristics they chose. A panelist could give each characteristic one point if he or she believed that all questions were equally important or could use all of the points on one characteristic if he or she believed that there was only one that was important. Any combination could be used as long as the total did not surpass the sum that was assigned for the question.

When analyzing the results, the characteristics were prioritized based on their average scores. The average score indicated the degree to which the trait was valued relative to the other traits.

#### Distribution and Return Rate of the Round Two Instrument

The Round Two instrument was mailed/e-mailed April 30, 2002. Packets were sent to the 46 panelists who were still part of the study. In addition to the Round Two questionnaire, the packet also included a cover letter, directions for completion of the questionnaire, and a stamped self-addressed envelope for the convenience of the panel members corresponding through mail. The cover letter requested that the instruments be returned by May 7, 2002. A copy of this material is provided in Appendix F.

The researcher found that 24 panelists had responded by May 7, 2002. To increase the returns, the researcher e-mailed or phoned those panelists who had not yet returned their instruments on May 8, 2002. The returns increased to 30 by May 16, 2002. The researcher



again phoned or e-mailed the non-responding participants on May 17, 2002 requesting their instruments. Some panelists had lost their questionnaires so the researcher faxed the questionnaire to two panelists to help facilitate the process. The responses increased to 37 on May 24, 2002, resulting in a response rate of 80%, which was equal to that of the first round.

### Methodology for Data Summary

The researcher organized the data into a spreadsheet. The data were then analyzed using the SPSS software program to determine the mean and standard deviation for each of the 110 items. The results are organized in Tables 3 and 4, which display the items in rank order. Additionally, Tables 3 and 4 include the mean standard deviations.

### Round Two Findings and Analysis

This segment of the study summarizes the findings from Round Two.

### Ethical Characteristics

Table 3 includes the values assigned to traits that were identified by panelists in question 1 of Round One. Panelists were asked to list the traits they believed were associated with an ethical leader.

Table 3  
Round 2 Perceptions Of 37 Delphi Members For The Desired Characteristics Of Ethical Leaders

Characteristic	Minimum	Maximum	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Integrity	0	30	4.03	5.44
Honest	0	10	3.00	2.35

Table 3 Continued

Characteristic	Minimum	Maximum	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Follows biblical principles of behavior	0	10	2.54	3.04
High moral standards / Firm Convictions	0	10	2.22	2.45
Fair / Unbiased	0	10	1.95	2.09
Dependable	0	6	1.78	1.69
Knows right from wrong	0	10	1.68	2.12
Strong Character	0	5	1.49	1.61
Consistent	0	5	1.46	1.57
Free from prejudice	0	5	1.35	1.67
Compassionate / Caring	0	5	1.32	1.40
Obeys the rules	0	5	1.30	1.41
Maintains confidentiality	0	5	1.27	1.24
Strives to serve	0	7	1.19	1.52
Selfless / Puts others first	0	10	1.16	1.79
Delegates authority / Lets others lead	0	10	1.05	1.99
Loyal	0	5	1.05	1.18
Resourceful	0	10	1.03	1.88
Disciplined	0	5	1.03	1.24
Wise / Common sense	0	5	.97	1.04
Good listener	0	6	.92	1.23
Attune to the changing needs of others	0	10	.86	1.81
Courage in decision making	0	5	.78	1.08
Publicly recognizes the works of others	0	5	.78	1.06
Courageous	0	10	.73	1.69
Tactful	0	6	.70	1.08
Mature	0	4	.70	.88
Courteous	0	5	.68	.91
Continually learning	0	2	.65	1.03
Patient	0	5	.65	.59
Empathetic / Sympathetic	0	2	.65	.72
Lacks duplicity	0	5	.62	1.06
Straightforward	0	5	.62	.92
Priorities greater than work	0	5	.59	1.19
Energetic	0	5	.57	.99
Goes the extra mile	0	3	.57	.80
Diligent	0	3	.54	.77
Authentic	0	3	.54	.84

Table 3 Continued

Characteristic	Minimum	Maximum	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Goal Oriented	0	3	.51	.84
Logical	0	3	.51	.77
Diplomatic	0	5	.51	.90
Creates a safe working environment	0	3	.46	.73
Introspective / Reflective thinker	0	3	.43	.69
Passionate	0	3	.43	.69
Defends those less fortunate	0	2	.41	.60
Persistent	0	2	.41	.60
Risk taker	0	3	.41	.72
Does things in a timely Manner	0	1	.38	.49
Makes decisions and sticks by them	0	2	.32	.58
Volunteers in community	0	2	.30	.52

### Leadership Traits

The following results reflect the values assigned to traits that were identified by panelists in question 2 of Round One. In question 2, panelists were asked to list the traits they believed were associated with a successful leader.

Table 4  
Round 2 Perceptions Of 37 Delphi Members For The Desired Leadership Traits Of Successful Individuals

Characteristic	Minimum	Maximum	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Leads by example	0	21	3.57	4.50
Develops an atmosphere of trust	0	15	2.65	3.05
Involves others in decisions	0	15	2.43	2.97
Honest / Truthful	0	10	2.05	2.15

Table 4 Continued

Characteristic	Minimum	Maximum	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Team builder	0	10	1.95	2.12
Good communicator /				
Articulate	0	6	1.73	1.71
Organized	0	12	1.68	2.65
Creates a vision for other				
to follow	0	10	1.51	1.99
Accepts responsibility	0	6	1.35	1.42
Weighs options before				
making a decision	0	10	1.35	1.98
Publicly recognizes the				
work of others	0	5	1.35	1.30
Hires the best people				
possible	0	10	1.32	2.27
Sense of humor	0	6	1.32	1.45
Good judgment /				
Decision maker	0	10	1.32	2.00
Self-motivated	0	6	1.30	1.47
Seeks first to understand /				
Asks questions	0	6	1.24	1.48
Humble	0	6	1.22	1.53
Delegates authority	0	5	1.19	1.35
Practices the golden rule	0	10	1.19	1.96
Optimistic	0	5	1.14	1.23
Motivator	0	5	1.11	1.29
Foster growth in others /				
Mentors	0	10	1.08	1.67
Genuine	0	10	1.08	1.85
Competent	0	5	1.05	1.22
Strong work ethic	0	10	1.00	1.68
Loyal	0	5	.95	1.08
Prioritizes goals based				
on needs	0	4	.92	.95
Respectful	0	5	.89	1.22
Knowledge of organization	0	5	.89	1.10
Forgiving	0	5	.89	1.07
Keeps current with research	0	5	.84	.93
Seeks new ways of				
doing things	0	10	.84	1.79
Accepts criticism	0	3	.81	.81
Courageous	0	5	.81	1.15

Table 4 Continued Characteristic	Minimum	Maximum	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Accessible	0	3	.78	.75
Puts others first	0	5	.78	.98
Focused	0	2	.76	.68
Calm under stress	0	5	.76	1.04
Tactful	0	5	.76	.98
Adaptable / Anticipates Trends	0	5	.73	.93
Cooperative	0	5	.73	.96
Perseveres	0	4	.73	.80
Mentally tough	0	6	.68	1.03
Empathetic / Sympathetic	0	4	.68	.78
Punctual	0	5	.68	1.00
Patient	0	4	.65	.82
Thorough	0	2	.65	.68
Financially savvy	0	10	.59	1.66
Expertise in the field	0	3	.54	.73
Wise / Prudent	0	1	.51	.51
Thoughtful	0	2	.51	.56
Diligent	0	1	.49	.51
Practical	0	1	.41	.50
Well rounded	0	2	.35	.54
Task oriented	0	2	.35	.54
Competitive spirit	0	1	.35	.48
Able to relax	0	1	.32	.47
Obedient	0	1	.32	.47
Reputation of past leadership	0	2	.24	.49
Predictable	0	1	.22	.42

### Summary

This chapter contained the analysis of the Round Two questionnaire, which was used to determine to what degree the panelists valued the traits that had been identified. The 110 items were generated from the two questions that were asked in Round One. The panelists' perceptions of the items were determined through the use of a constant sum scale. Chapter 6 includes a

presentation of the information regarding the construction, distribution, and analysis of the questionnaire used in Round Three.

CHAPTER 6  
ROUND THREE FINDINGS AND ANALYSIS

Introduction

This chapter includes a description of the procedure by which the Round Three questionnaire was constructed, distributed, and analyzed. An explanation of the results is also presented.

Construction of the Round Three Instrument

The data from the list of characteristics that were sent to the panelists were analyzed using the SPSS statistical program. The researcher organized the characteristics and traits in rank order based on the average scores obtained in Round Two for the construction of the Round Three questionnaire. One purpose of Round Three was to generate consensus on the values given to the characteristics and traits. A second purpose of Round Three was to generate consensus on the rank order of the characteristics and traits. In order to accomplish these tasks, the researcher organized two lists in rank order based on responses obtained during Round Two for panelists to consider.

The ranked characteristics and traits that formed the Round Three instrument were taken from the analysis of the data provided by the panelists in Round Two. Each trait/characteristic was listed with the mean obtained during the analysis of the data from Round Two. Panelists were again asked to assign value to the traits/characteristics. The third round questionnaire and the cover letter used in the study are found in Appendix G.

The third round questionnaire employed a constant sum scale to determine the priority of the characteristics and determine to what degree they were valued. The panelists were asked to take a sum of 50 points for question one and 60 points for question two to assign values to the characteristics. A panelist could give each characteristic one point if he or she believed that each was important or could use all of the points on one characteristic if he or she believed that there was only one characteristic that was important. Any combination could be used as long as the total did not surpass the sum that was given for the question. If the panelist agreed with the mean from Round Two, the panelist simply had to write “no change” on the questionnaire.

When analyzing the results, the characteristics were ranked according to their item means. The item mean indicated the degree to which the trait was valued compared to the other traits.

#### Distribution and Return Rate of the Round Three Instrument

The Round Two instrument was mailed on May 31, 2002. Packets were sent to the 46 panelists who were still part of the study. In addition to the Round Three questionnaire, the packet included a cover letter, directions for completion of the questionnaire, and a stamped self-addressed envelope for the convenience of the panel members corresponding through surface mail. The cover letter requested that the instruments be returned by June 10, 2002. Copies of these materials are provided in Appendix G.

Thirty panelists had responded by June 10, 2002. To increase the returns, the researcher e-mailed or phoned those panelists who had not yet returned their instruments on June 11, 2002. The returns increased to 36 by June 14, 2002, giving a response rate of 78%. This response rate was close to those of the first and second rounds.



### Methodology for Data Summary

The researcher organized the data into a spreadsheet. The data were then analyzed using the SPSS statistical program to determine the mean and standard deviation for each of the 110 items. The results are presented in Tables 5 and 6.

### Round Three Findings and Analysis

Tables 5 and 6 contain the data analysis of the responses provided by the panelists in the third iteration. A brief interpretation of the data follows each table.

### Ethical Characteristics

The following results are the values assigned to traits that were identified by panelists in question 1 of Round One. Panelists were asked to list the traits they believed were associated with an ethical leader. They could view the average score the trait received in Round Two and change the value or simply state that the value was acceptable the way it was presented. The results are shown in Table 5.

Table 5  
Round 3 Perceptions Of 36 Delphi Members For The Desired Characteristics Of Ethical Leaders

Characteristic	Minimum	Maximum	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Integrity	0	20	5.80	3.81
Follows biblical principles of behavior	0	10	3.91	2.85
Honest	0	10	3.42	2.36
High moral standards / Firm Convictions	0	10	3.08	2.11
Fair / Unbiased	0	10	2.55	2.43
Strong Character	0	10	2.02	2.52

Table 5 Continued

Characteristic	Minimum	Maximum	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Dependable	0	6	1.91	1.57
Compassionate / Caring	0	6	1.69	1.67
Knows right from wrong	0	5	1.61	1.55
Strives to serve	0	10	1.41	2.07
Free from prejudice	0	5	1.38	1.57
Wise / Common sense	0	5	1.25	1.54
Selfless / Puts others first	0	6	1.25	1.67
Disciplined	0	5	1.08	1.36
Delegates authority / Lets others lead	0	10	1.05	1.77
Maintains confidentiality	0	5	1.05	1.24
Courage in decision making	0	10	1.00	1.83
Good listener	0	5	.97	1.31
Consistent	0	4	.94	1.09
Obeys the rules	0	5	.86	1.19
Loyal	0	5	.80	1.09
Resourceful	0	10	.75	1.66
Tactful	0	6	.72	1.11
Publicly recognizes the works of others	0	5	.69	1.06
Empathetic / Sympathetic	0	5	.63	.93
Courageous	0	4	.61	.87
Goes the extra mile	0	5	.58	.90
Attuned to the changing needs of others	0	5	.55	.90
Continually learning	0	2	.52	.60
Mature	0	2	.52	.60
Patient	0	2	.50	.56
Energetic	0	1	.44	.50
Logical	0	1	.44	.50
Authentic	0	2	.44	.55
Lacks duplicity	0	3	.44	.65
Straightforward	0	1	.44	.50
Courteous	0	1	.44	.50
Diligent	0	1	.41	.50
Priorities greater than work	0	1	.41	.50
Volunteers in community	0	5	.36	1.07
Defends those less fortunate	0	5	.22	.89
Does things in a timely manner	0	4	.22	.76
Risk taker	0	3	.22	.68
Passionate	0	3	.19	.62

Table 5 Continued				
Characteristic	Minimum	Maximum	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Diplomatic	0	1	.11	.31
Introspective / Reflective thinker	0	1	.11	.31
Creates a safe working environment	0	1	.11	.31
Persistent	0	1	.05	.23
Goal Oriented	0	1	.05	.23
Makes decisions and sticks by them	0	0	.00	.00

### Leadership Traits

The following results reflect the values assigned to traits that were identified by panelists in question 2 of Round One. Panelists were asked to list the traits they believed were associated with a successful leader. Panelists were allowed to view the item mean of Round Two that each trait received. Panelists had the option of changing the value the trait had received or state that the value was acceptable as it was presented. The table represents the data that were generated in the third round for question two.

Table 6  
Round 3 Perceptions Of 36 Delphi Members For The Desired Leadership Traits Of Successful Individuals

Characteristic	Minimum	Maximum	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Leads by example	0	20	5.69	4.24
Develops an atmosphere of trust	0	15	3.80	3.21
Honest / Truthful	0	10	3.72	3.00
Involves others in decisions	0	20	3.30	3.68
Team builder	0	10	2.86	2.42
Good communicator /				

Table 6 Continued

Characteristic	Minimum	Maximum	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Articulate	0	10	2.80	2.40
Creates a vision for other to follow	0	10	2.58	2.55
Foster growth in others / Mentors	0	10	1.50	1.96
Accepts responsibility	0	5	1.50	1.53
Sense of humor	0	10	1.44	1.96
Publicly recognizes the work of others	0	5	1.44	1.52
Hires the best people possible	0	10	1.44	2.04
Organized	0	5	1.41	1.22
Optimistic	0	5	1.22	1.14
Humble	0	10	1.22	1.91
Good judgment / Decision maker	0	4	1.08	1.15
Strong work ethic	0	5	1.05	1.21
Practices the golden rule	0	10	1.02	1.82
Weighs options before making a decision	0	5	1.02	1.27
Self-motivated	0	5	.91	1.02
Seeks first to understand / Asks questions	0	5	.91	1.18
Prioritizes goals based on needs	0	5	.86	1.07
Delegates authority	0	3	.86	.86
Empathetic / Sympathetic	0	10	.83	1.66
Motivator	0	5	.77	1.01
Respectful	0	5	.69	.92
Calm under stress	0	3	.66	.67
Knowledge of organization	0	4	.66	.75
Mentally tough	0	3	.61	.76
Tactful	0	4	.61	.76
Patient	0	2	.58	.55
Focused	0	4	.58	.77
Accepts criticism	0	3	.58	.64
Seeks new ways of doing Things	0	3	.58	.69
Keeps current with research	0	3	.58	.64
Loyal	0	2	.58	.55
Punctual	0	2	.55	.55
Forgiving	0	4	.55	.77

Table 6 Continued				
Characteristic	Minimum	Maximum	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>
Competent	0	2	.55	.60
Courageous	0	2	.55	.60
Perseveres	0	2	.52	.55
Accessible	0	2	.52	.55
Expertise in the field	0	1	.50	.50
Financially savvy	0	1	.50	.50
Genuine	0	1	.47	.50
Cooperative	0	1	.47	.50
Thorough	0	1	.44	.50
Adaptable /Anticipates trends	0	1	.41	.50
Puts others first	0	1	.38	.49
Wise / Prudent	0	3	.27	.74
Diligent	0	1	.16	.37
Well rounded	0	1	.16	.56
Thoughtful	0	1	.13	.35
Practical	0	1	.13	.35
Able to relax	0	3	.11	.52
Competitive spirit	0	2	.11	.39
Predictable	0	2	.08	.36
Reputation of past Leadership	0	1	.08	.28
Task oriented	0	1	.08	.28
Obedient	0	0	.00	.00

### Analysis Between Groups

The scores of panelists were grouped together according to their roles as Religious, Educational, Political, and Business leaders. Their scores on each item were then compared using the SPSS statistical program. Analysis revealed significant differences on a number of traits. The statistical tests were conducted with an alpha error rate of .05. The specific hypotheses tested in Tables 7 and 8 were as follows:

H02<sub>1</sub>: There were no significant differences in the item means of the Ethical Leadership items, based on the respondents' occupational type (corresponds to Table 7).

H02<sub>2</sub>: There were no significant differences in the item means of the Leadership Trait items based on the respondents' occupational type (corresponds to Table 8).

In making a decision to reject or retain each of these more general hypotheses, the following decision-rule was used. If there were any significant differences on a specific item in each of the two areas, the overall general hypothesis was rejected; i.e., if any one items was statistically significant, the more general hypotheses was rejected.

The comparison of item means is reported in tables seven and eight. The comparisons of characteristics of ethical leaders are given in Table 7.

Table 7  
Analysis Of Variance (ANOVA) Comparison Of Mean Ratings On The Characteristics Of Ethical Leaders By Organizational Type

Characteristic	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>	Turkey LSD PostHoc Comparison
Integrity:						
(1) Religious	10	5.60	3.47	1.74	.178	
(2) Educational	11	5.00	3.31			
(3) Business	9	8.11	5.1			
(4) Political	6	4.16	.98			
Honesty:						
(1) Religious	10	3.00	2.17	.489	.693	
(2) Educational	11	3.09	1.13			
(3) Business	9	4.22	3.92			
(4) Political	6	3.50	1.22			
Follows Biblical Principles of Behavior:						

Table 7 Continued

Characteristic	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>	Turkey LSD PostHoc Comparison
(1) Religious	10	4.70	3.19	1.36	.272	
(2) Educational	11	2.72	1.19			
(3) Business	9	4.88	4.13			
(4) Political	6	1.36	.55			
High Moral Standards/Firm Convictions:						
(1) Religious	10	2.80	2.25	2.22	.104	
(2) Educational	11	2.36	1.12			
(3) Business	9	4.55	2.69			
(4) Political	6	2.66	1.63			
Fair/Unbiased:						
(1) Religious	10	2.00	2.26	.582	.631	
(2) Educational	11	3.27	2.37			
(3) Business	9	2.66	3.42			
(4) Political	6	2.00	.00			
Dependable:						
(1) Religious	10	2.50	2.22	2.00	.133	
(2) Educational	11	2.18	1.16			
(3) Business	9	.88	1.36			
(4) Political	6	2.00	.00			
Knows Right From Wrong:						
(1) Religious	10	1.10	1.66	.991	.410	
(2) Educational	11	2.18	1.16			
(3) Business	9	1.33	2.17			
(4) Political	6	1.83	.40			
Strong Character:						
(1) Religious	10	1.90	2.23	1.07	.375	
(2) Educational	11	1.72	1.34			
(3) Business	9	3.22	4.17			
(4) Political	6	1.00	.00			

Table 7 Continued

Characteristic	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>	Turkey LSD PostHoc Comparison
Consistent:						
(1) Religious	10	.70	1.25	1.39	.263	
(2) Educational	11	1.45	1.21			
(3) Business	9	.55	1.01			
(4) Political	6	1.00	.00			
Free From Prejudice:						
(1) Religious	10	2.50	2.27	.3.78	.02	>3
(2) Educational	11	1.36	1.20			
(3) Business	9	.33	.50			
(4) Political	6	1.16	.40			
Compassionate/Caring:						
(1) Religious	10	2.70	2.21	2.35	.09	
(2) Educational	11	1.72	1.34			
(3) Business	9	1.11	1.45			
(4) Political	6	.83	.40			
Obeys The Rules:						
(1) Religious	10	.70	1.56	.38	.76	
(2) Educational	11	1.18	1.07			
(3) Business	9	.66	1.32			
(4) Political	6	.83	.40			
Maintain Confidentiality:						
(1) Religious	10	1.30	1.63	1.33	.279	
(2) Educational	11	1.45	1.21			
(3) Business	9	.44	1.01			
(4) Political	6	.83	.40			
Strives To Serve:						
(1) Religious	10	1.90	2.23	.87	.466	
(2) Educational	11	.81	.60			
(3) Business	9	2.00	3.35			



Table 7 Continued

Characteristic	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>	Turkey LSD PostHoc Comparison
(4) Political	6	.83	.40			
Selfless/Puts Others First:						
(1) Religious	10	1.80	2.48	.74	.532	
(2) Educational	11	.81	.60			
(3) Business	9	1.44	2.00			
(4) Political	6	.83	.40			
Loyal:						
(1) Religious	10	.70	1.25	.184	.90	
(2) Educational	11	1.00	.63			
(3) Business	9	.66	1.65			
(4) Political	6	.83	.40			
Delegates Authority/Lets Others Lead:						
(1) Religious	10	.50	.97	1.18	.33	
(2) Educational	11	.72	.64			
(3) Business	9	1.88	3.21			
(4) Political	6	1.33	.81			
Resourceful:						
(1) Religious	10	.30	.48	1.44	.248	
(2) Educational	11	1.54	2.84			
(3) Business	9	.22	.44			
(4) Political	6	.83	.40			
Disciplined:						
(1) Religious	10	1.90	1.96	1.92	.146	
(2) Educational	11	.90	.70			
(3) Business	9	.55	1.33			
(4) Political	6	.83	.40			
Wise/Common Sense:						
(1) Religious	10	2.11	2.26	1.54	.224	

Table 7 Continued

Characteristic	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>	Turkey LSD PostHoc Comparison
(2) Educational	11	1.00	.63			
(3) Business	9	.66	1.65			
(4) Political	6	1.33	.81			
Good Listener:						
(1) Religious	10	.50	.70	2.91	.049	<3
(2) Educational	11	.63	.50			<3
(3) Business	9	2.00	2.23			>1,2
(4) Political	6	.83	.40			
Attune To The Changing Needs Of Others:						
(1) Religious	10	.30	.48	2.26	.099	
(2) Educational	11	1.00	1.41			
(3) Business	9	.11	.33			
(4) Political	6	.83	.40			
Publicly Recognizes The Works Of Others:						
(1) Religious	10	.20	.42	1.57	.214	
(2) Educational	11	.63	.50			
(3) Business	9	1.22	1.92			
(4) Political	6	.83	.40			
Courage In Decision Making:						
(1) Religious	10	.30	.48	1.25	.308	
(2) Educational	11	1.72	2.79			
(3) Business	9	.66	1.65			
(4) Political	6	1.33	.81			
Courageous:						
(1) Religious	10	.30	.48	1.98	.135	
(2) Educational	11	.54	.52			
(3) Business	9	.55	1.33			
(4) Political	6	1.33	.81			
Tactful:						

Table 7 Continued

Characteristic	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>	Turkey LSD PostHoc Comparison
(1) Religious	10	.60	.96	3.16	.038	<4
(2) Educational	11	.63	.50			<4
(3) Business	9	.22	.44			<4
(4) Political	6	1.83	2.04			>1,2,3
Mature:						
(1) Religious	10	.40	.69	1.08	.37	
(2) Educational	11	.63	.50			
(3) Business	9	.33	.70			
(4) Political	6	.83	.40			
Courteous:						
(1) Religious	10	.30	.48	4.22	.013	<4
(2) Educational	11	.63	.50			>3
(3) Business	9	.11	.33			<2,4
(4) Political	6	.83	.40			>1,3
Empathetic/Sympathetic						
(1) Religious	10	.80	1.54	1.32	.284	
(2) Educational	11	.81	.60			
(3) Business	9	.11	.33			
(4) Political	6	.83	.40			
Patient:						
(1) Religious	10	.30	.48	1.71	.184	
(2) Educational	11	.63	.50			
(3) Business	9	.33	.70			
(4) Political	6	.83	.40			
Continually Learning:						
(1) Religious	10	.50	.70	.80	.50	
(2) Educational	11	.54	.52			
(3) Business	9	.33	.70			
(4) Political	6	.83	.40			

Table 7 Continued

Characteristic	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>	Turkey LSD PostHoc Comparison
Straightforward:						
(1) Religious	10	.30	.48	2.47	.08	
(2) Educational	11	.54	.52			
(3) Business	9	.22	.44			
(4) Political	6	.83	.40			
Lacks Duplicity:						
(1) Religious	10	.30	.48	.37	.77	
(2) Educational	11	.45	.52			
(3) Business	9	.44	1.01			
(4) Political	6	.66	.51			
Priorities Greater Than Work:						
(1) Religious	10	.30	.48	3.58	.024	<4
(2) Educational	11	.54	.52			>3
(3) Business	9	.11	.33			<2
(4) Political	6	.83	.40			>1,3
Energetic:						
(1) Religious	10	.30	.48	2.47	.08	
(2) Educational	11	.54	.52			
(3) Business	9	.22	.44			
(4) Political	6	.83	.40			
Goes The Extra Mile:						
(1) Religious	10	.80	1.54	.81	.49	
(2) Educational	11	.54	.52			
(3) Business	9	.22	.44			
(4) Political	6	.83	.40			
Diligent:						
(1) Religious	10	.30	.48	1.42	.252	
(2) Educational	11	.54	.52			
(3) Business	9	.22	.44			

Table 7 Continued

Characteristic	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>	Turkey LSD PostHoc Comparison
(4) Political	6	.66	.51			
Authentic:						
(1) Religious	10	.30	.48	.76	.52	
(2) Educational	11	.54	.52			
(3) Business	9	.33	.70			
(4) Political	6	.66	.51			
Logical:						
(1) Religious	10	.30	.48	2.47	.08	
(2) Educational	11	.54	.52			
(3) Business	9	.22	.44			
(4) Political	6	.83	.40			
Goal Oriented:						
(1) Religious	10	.00	.00	.89	.45	
(2) Educational	11	.16	.30			
(3) Business	9	.00	.00			
(4) Political	6	.16	.40			
Diplomatic:						
(1) Religious	10	.10	.31	.07	.97	
(2) Educational	11	.11	.30			
(3) Business	9	.11	.33			
(4) Political	6	.16	.40			
Creates A Safe Working Environment:						
(1) Religious	10	.10	.31	.43	.73	
(2) Educational	11	.10	.30			
(3) Business	9	.00	.00			
(4) Political	6	.16	.40			
Introspective/Reflective Thinker:						
(1) Religious	10	.10	.31	.43	.73	

Table 7 Continued

Characteristic	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>	Turkey LSD PostHoc Comparison
(2) Educational	11	.10	.30			
(3) Business	9	.00	.00			
(4) Political	6	.16	.40			
Passionate:						
(1) Religious	10	.10	.31	.58	.62	
(2) Educational	11	.18	.60			
(3) Business	9	.11	.33			
(4) Political	6	.50	1.22			
Risk Taker:						
(1) Religious	10	.00	.00	1.29	.293	
(2) Educational	11	.10	.30			
(3) Business	9	.55	1.13			
(4) Political	6	.33	.81			
Persistent:						
(1) Religious	10	.10	.31	.47	.70	
(2) Educational	11	.10	.30			
(3) Business	9	.00	.00			
(4) Political	6	.00	.00			
Defends Those Less Fortunate:						
(1) Religious	10	.70	1.63	1.40	.25	
(2) Educational	11	.00	.00			
(3) Business	9	.00	.00			
(4) Political	6	.16	.40			
Does Things In A Timely Manner:						
(1) Religious	10	.10	.31	1.02	.39	
(2) Educational	11	.00	.00			
(3) Business	9	.55	1.33			
(4) Political	6	.33	.81			

Table 7 Continued

Characteristic	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>	Turkey LSD PostHoc Comparison
Makes Decisions And Sticks By Them:						
(1) Religious	10	.00	.00	.00	.00	
(2) Educational	11	.00	.00			
(3) Business	9	.00	.00			
(4) Political	6	.00	.00			
Volunteers In The Community:						
(1) Religious	10	.60	1.57	.61	.61	
(2) Educational	11	.00	.00			
(3) Business	9	.44	1.01			
(4) Political	6	.50	1.22			

### Ethical Characteristics

The comparisons in Table 7 reveal significant differences between two or more groups on five characteristics. Each characteristic is presented below.

Free From Prejudice. The Religious and the Business communities differed on this ethical trait. The mean difference was 2.16. The respondents representing the religious community had an item mean of 2.50 (SD = 2.27), compared to an item mean of .33 (SD= .50) for the respondents representing the business community (p=.002).

Good listener: Values assigned by the Business community representatives significantly differed from those assigned by both the Religious and the Educational community representatives' ties. The mean differences were 1.50 and 1.36 respectively. The values assigned by members of Business group resulted in an item mean of 2.00 (SD = 2.23) compared to the item mean of .50 (SD = .70) of the members of the religious group and the Education

group's item mean of .63 (SD = .50). The level of significance was measured at .012 and .019 respectively.

Tactful. The group that differed from the others in regard to this trait was the Political group. The Political community differed from the Religious, Education, and Business groups with mean differences of 1.23, 1.19, and 1.61, respectively. Representatives of the Political group had an item mean of 1.83 (SD = 2.04). The item means of the other three groups were much lower. The Religious group's item mean was .60 (SD = .96) and the Education group's item mean was not much higher at .63 (SD = .50). The lowest item mean was obtained from business representatives. Their values resulted in an item mean of .22 (SD = .44). The levels of significance were measured at .026, .027, and .005, respectively.

Courteous. The analysis of the item means revealed that the groups were split. The Religious and Business Communities differed from the Education and Political Communities. The Political and Education groups had higher item means. The Political item mean was .83 (SD = .40) and the Education item mean was .63 (SD = .50) as compared to the item mean of the Religious item mean of .30 (SD = .48) and the Business mean of .11 (SD = .33).

Priorities Greater Than Work. The analysis of this trait resulted in two sets of differences. The Political community differed from the Business and Religious community with mean differences of .72 and .53, respectively. The Education group also differed significantly from the Business group with a mean difference of .43. The Political group had an item mean of .83 (SD = .40). The Business and Religious groups had item means that were not as high. They reported item means of .11 (SD = .33) and .30 (SD = .48), respectively. The item mean of .54 (SD = .52) of the Education group was resulted in a difference significant at the .024 level. Based on these findings, the general research hypothesis, H02<sub>1</sub> was rejected.



A comparison of the successful leadership traits is shown in Table 8. Significant differences were found on 16 of the comparisons. A presentation of those scores a presented in Table 8 and is followed by a brief description of the significant differences found in the table.

Table 8  
Analysis Of Variance (ANOVA) Comparison Of Participant Ratings Of The Leadership Traits Of Successful Individuals, By Occupational Type

Characteristic	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>	Turkey LSD PostHoc Comparisson
Leads By Example:						
(1) Religious	10	6.10	3.17	4.18	.013	
(2) Educational	11	3.63	.92			<3
(3) Business	9	9.11	6.62			>2,4
(4) Political	6	3.66	.81			<3
Develops An Atmosphere Of Trust:						
(1) Religious	10	4.00	2.30	.40	.75	
(2) Educational	11	3.90	3.72			
(3) Business	9	4.33	4.44			
(4) Political	6	2.50	.83			
Involves Others In Decisions:						
(1) Religious	10	3.40	2.01	.40	.75	
(2) Educational	11	3.90	5.37			
(3) Business	9	3.44	4.06			
(4) Political	6	1.83	.40			
Honest/Truthful:						
(1) Religious	10	5.00	3.09	3.21	.036	>2
(2) Educational	11	2.00	.89			<1,3
(3) Business	9	5.11	4.10			>2
(4) Political	6	2.66	1.63			
Team Builder:						
(1) Religious	10	3.60	2.27	.52	.66	

Table 8 Continued

Characteristic	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>	Turkey LSD PostHoc Comparisson
(2) Educational	11	2.90	2.42			
(3) Business	9	2.33	3.31			
(4) Political	6	2.33	.81			
Good Communicator/Articulate:						
(1) Religious	10	3.40	2.06	1.76	.17	
(2) Educational	11	1.90	.94			
(3) Business	9	3.88	3.95			
(4) Political	6	1.83	.40			
Organized:						
(1) Religious	10	1.20	1.61	1.86	.15	
(2) Educational	11	1.90	.94			
(3) Business	9	.77	1.20			
(4) Political	6	1.83	.40			
Creates A Vision For Others To Follow:						
(1) Religious	10	4.10	3.14	2.27	.09	
(2) Educational	11	1.54	.82			
(3) Business	9	2.77	3.38			
(4) Political	6	1.66	.51			
Accepts Responsibility:						
(1) Religious	10	2.00	2.05	1.29	.29	
(2) Educational	11	1.81	1.40			
(3) Business	9	.77	1.39			
(4) Political	6	1.16	.40			
Weighs Options Before Making A Decision:						
(1) Religious	10	.70	1.25	.51	.67	
(2) Educational	11	1.36	1.28			
(3) Business	9	.88	1.69			
(4) Political	6	1.16	.40			
Publicly Recognizes The Work Of Others:						
(1) Religious	10	1.90	1.96	1.20	.32	

Table 8 Continued

Characteristic	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>	Turkey LSD PostHoc Comparisson
(2) Educational	11	.90	.53			
(3) Business	9	1.88	2.08			
(4) Political	6	1.00	1.52			
Hires The Best People Possible:						
(1) Religious	10	1.30	2.00	.40	.74	
(2) Educational	11	1.18	1.07			
(3) Business	9	2.11	3.40			
(4) Political	6	1.16	.40			
Sense Of Humor:						
(1) Religious	10	1.60	1.89	.37	.77	
(2) Educational	11	1.27	1.00			
(3) Business	9	1.88	3.29			
(4) Political	6	.83	.40			
Good Judgment/Decision Maker:						
(1) Religious	10	.50	.70	1.42	.25	
(2) Educational	11	1.45	1.03			
(3) Business	9	1.33	1.80			
(4) Political	6	1.00	.00			
Self-Motivated:						
(1) Religious	10	1.00	1.56	.22	.88	
(2) Educational	11	1.00	.63			
(3) Business	9	.66	1.11			
(4) Political	6	1.00	.00			
Seeks First To Understand/Asks Questions:						
(1) Religious	10	.80	1.54	.05	.98	
(2) Educational	11	.90	.53			
(3) Business	9	1.00	1.73			
(4) Political	6	1.00	.00			
Humble:						
(1) Religious	10	.80	1.54	1.41	.25	
(2) Educational	11	.81	.60			

Table 8 Continued

Characteristic	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>	Turkey LSD PostHoc Comparisson
(3) Business	9	2.33	3.27			
(4) Political	6	1.00	.63			
Delegates Authority:						
(1) Religious	10	.90	1.19	.08	.96	
(2) Educational	11	.81	.60			
(3) Business	9	.77	1.09			
(4) Political	6	1.00	.00			
Practices The Golden Rule:						
(1) Religious	10	1.70	3.30	1.25	.30	
(2) Educational	11	1.18	.75			
(3) Business	9	.11	.33			
(4) Political	6	1.00	.00			
Optimistic:						
(1) Religious	10	1.30	1.63	.09	.96	
(2) Educational	11	1.27	.78			
(3) Business	9	1.22	1.39			
(4) Political	6	1.00	.00			
Motivator:						
(1) Religious	10	.80	1.54	2.42	.08	
(2) Educational	11	1.27	.78			
(3) Business	9	.11	.33			
(4) Political	6	.83	.40			
Fosters Growth In Others/Mentors:						
(1) Religious	10	2.10	3.17	.54	.65	
(2) Educational	11	1.00	.63			
(3) Business	9	1.55	1.94			
(4) Political	6	1.33	.81			
Genuine:						
(1) Religious	10	.30	.48	5.27	.005	<2,4

Table 8 Continued

Characteristic	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>	Turkey LSD PostHoc Comparisson
(2) Educational	11	.72	.46			>1,3
(3) Business	9	.11	.33			<2,4
(4) Political	6	.83	.40			>1,3
Competent:						
(1) Religious	10	.30	.48	6.90	.001	<2,4
(2) Educational	11	1.00	.63			>1,3
(3) Business	9	.11	.33			<2,4
(4) Political	6	.83	.40			>1,3
Strong Work Ethic:						
(1) Religious	10	1.00	1.56	.11	.95	
(2) Educational	11	1.18	.75			
(3) Business	9	.88	1.69			
(4) Political	6	1.16	.40			
Loyal:						
(1) Religious	10	.30	.48	12.31	.00	<2,4
(2) Educational	11	1.00	.44			>1,3
(3) Business	9	.11	.33			<2,4
(4) Political	6	1.00	.00			>1,3
Prioritizes Goals Based On Needs:						
(1) Religious	10	.90	1.59	.02	.99	
(2) Educational	11	.90	.53			
(3) Business	9	.77	1.30			
(4) Political	6	.83	.40			
Respectful:						
(1) Religious	10	.30	.48	1.23	.31	
(2) Educational	11	.81	.40			
(3) Business	9	.66	1.65			
(4) Political	6	1.16	.40			

Table 8 Continued

Characteristic	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>	Turkey LSD PostHoc Comparisson
Knowledge Of Organization:						
(1) Religious	10	.30	.48	1.23	.31	
(2) Educational	11	.81	.40			
(3) Business	9	.77	1.30			
(4) Political	6	.83	.40			
Forgiving:						
(1) Religious	10	.30	.48	.56	.64	
(2) Educational	11	.72	.46			
(3) Business	9	.55	1.33			
(4) Political	6	.66	.51			
Keeps Current With Research:						
(1) Religious	10	.30	.48	1.63	.20	
(2) Educational	11	.81	.40			
(3) Business	9	.44	1.01			
(4) Political	6	.83	.40			
Seeks New Ways Of Doing Things:						
(1) Religious	10	.30	.48	1.41	.25	
(2) Educational	11	.81	.60			
(3) Business	9	.44	1.01			
(4) Political	6	.83	.40			
Accepts Criticism:						
(1) Religious	10	.30	.48	1.91	.14	
(2) Educational	11	.72	.46			
(3) Business	9	.44	1.01			
(4) Political	6	1.00	.00			
Courageous:						
(1) Religious	10	.30	.48	3.83	.01	<4
(2) Educational	11	.63	.50			
(3) Business	9	.33	.70			
(4) Political	6	1.16	.40			

Table 8 Continued

Characteristic	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>	Turkey LSD PostHoc Comparisson
Accessible:						
(1) Religious	10	.30	.48	6.72	.00	<2,4
(2) Educational	11	.90	.53			>1,3
(3) Business	9	.11	.33			<2,4
(4) Political	6	.83	.40			>1
Puts Others First:						
(1) Religious	10	.30	.48	3.26	.03	<4
(2) Educational	11	.45	.52			
(3) Business	9	.11	.33			<4
(4) Political	6	.83	.40			>1,3
Focused:						
(1) Religious	10	.30	.48	.77	.51	
(2) Educational	11	.72	.46			
(3) Business	9	.55	1.33			
(4) Political	6	.83	.40			
Calm Under Stress:						
(1) Religious	10	.50	.70	1.21	.31	
(2) Educational	11	.81	.40			
(3) Business	9	.44	1.01			
(4) Political	6	1.00	.00			
Tactful:						
(1) Religious	10	.30	.48	7.41	.001	<4
(2) Educational	11	.81	.40			>1,3
(3) Business	9	.11	.33			<2,4
(4) Political	6	1.50	1.22			>1,2,3
Adaptable/Anticipates Trends:						
(1) Religious	10	.30	.48	2.92	.04	
(2) Educational	11	.63	.50			>3
(3) Business	9	.11	.33			<2,4
(4) Political	6	.66	.51			>3

Table 8 Continued

Characteristic	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>	Turkey LSD PostHoc Comparisson
Cooperative:						
(1) Religious	10	.30	.48	5.39	.00	<2
(2) Educational	11	.81	.40			
(3) Business	9	.11	.33			
(4) Political	6	.66	.51			
Perseveres:						
(1) Religious	10	.30	.48	2.17	.11	
(2) Educational	11	.72	.46			
(3) Business	9	.33	.70			
(4) Political	6	.83	.40			
Mentally Tough:						
(1) Religious	10	.30	.48	.85	.47	
(2) Educational	11	.63	.50			
(3) Business	9	.77	1.30			
(4) Political	6	.83	.40			
Empathetic/Sympathetic:						
(1) Religious	10	1.30	3.09	.54	.65	
(2) Educational	11	.72	.46			
(3) Business	9	.33	.70			
(4) Political	6	1.00	.00			
Punctual:						
(1) Religious	10	.50	.70	4.67	.00	>3
(2) Educational	11	.72	.46			
(3) Business	9	.11	.33			
(4) Political	6	1.00	.00			
Patient:						
(1) Religious	10	.30	.48	8.05	.00	<2,4
(2) Educational	11	.81	.40			
(3) Business	9	.22	.44			
(4) Political	6	1.16	.40			



Table 8 Continued

Characteristic	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>	Turkey LSD PostHoc Comparisson
Thorough:						
(1) Religious	10	.20	.42	5.45	.00	<4
(2) Educational	11	.54	.52			<4
(3) Business	9	.22	.44			<4
(4) Political	6	1.00	.00			>1,2,3
Financially Savvy:						
(1) Religious	10	.30	.48	7.89	.00	<2,4
(2) Educational	11	.72	.46			>1,3
(3) Business	9	.11	.33			<2,4
(4) Political	6	1.00	.00			>1,3
Expertise In The Field:						
(1) Religious	10	.30	.48	7.89	.00	<2,4
(2) Educational	11	.72	.46			>1,3
(3) Business	9	.11	.33			<2,4
(4) Political	6	1.00	.00			>1,3
Wise/Prudent:						
(1) Religious	10	.10	.31	1.13	.34	
(2) Educational	11	.18	.40			
(3) Business	9	.66	1.32			
(4) Political	6	.16	.40			
Thoughtful:						
(1) Religious	10	.10	.31	.27	.84	
(2) Educational	11	.10	.30			
(3) Business	9	.22	.44			
(4) Political	6	.16	.40			
Diligent:						
(1) Religious	10	.10	.31	.54	.65	
(2) Educational	11	.18	.40			
(3) Business	9	.11	.33			
(4) Political	6	.33	.51			

Table 8 Continued

Characteristic	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>	Turkey LSD PostHoc Comparisson
Practical:						
(1) Religious	10	.10	.31	1.06	.37	
(2) Educational	11	.27	.46			
(3) Business	9	.00	.00			
(4) Political	6	.16	.40			
Well rounded:						
(1) Religious	10	.10	.31	.35	.78	
(2) Educational	11	.10	.30			
(3) Business	9	.33	1.00			
(4) Political	6	.16	.40			
Task Oriented:						
(1) Religious	10	.10	.31	.43	.73	
(2) Educational	11	.10	.30			
(3) Business	9	.00	.00			
(4) Political	6	.16	.40			
Competitive Spirit:						
(1) Religious	10	.00	.00	1.59	.21	
(2) Educational	11	.00	.00			
(3) Business	9	.33	.70			
(4) Political	6	.16	.40			
Able to relax:						
(1) Religious	10	.00	.00	.87	.46	
(2) Educational	11	.00	.00			
(3) Business	9	.33	1.00			
(4) Political	6	.16	.40			
Obedient:						
(1) Religious	10	.00	.00	.00	.00	
(2) Educational	11	.00	.00			
(3) Business	9	.00	.00			
(4) Political	6	.00	.00			

Table 8 Continued

Characteristic	<u>n</u>	<u>M</u>	<u>SD</u>	<u>F</u>	<u>p</u>	Turkey LSD PostHoc Comparisson
Reputation of Past Leadership:						
(1) Religious	10	.10	.31	.52	.67	
(2) Educational	11	.00	.00			
(3) Business	9	.11	.33			
(4) Political	6	.16	.40			
Predictable:						
(1) Religious	10	.10	.31	1.30	.29	
(2) Educational	11	.00	.00			
(3) Business	9	.00	.00			
(4) Political	6	.33	.81			

### Successful Leadership Traits

The following is a brief description of the data that were presented in Table 8:

Leads by example. Significant differences were identified between item means obtained by the Business, Educational, and Political groups for this trait. The Business group had a mean difference from the Educational and Political groups of 5.47 and 5.44, respectively. Clearly, the Business group had a higher item mean on this trait, with a mean of 9.11 (SD = 6.62), in contrast to the item mean from the Education group item mean of 3.63 (SD = .92) and the Political group's item mean of 3.66 (SD = .81).

Honest/Truthful. The Education, Religious, and Business groups had significantly different item means on this trait. The Education community varied from the other two, with a mean difference of 3.00 from the Religious community and 3.11 from the Business community. Participants from both the Religious and the Business communities had higher items means on

this trait, with means of 5.00 and 5.11 respectively. The Education community representatives had an item mean of 2.00.

Genuine. Item mean calculated from values obtained by representatives of the Political and Education communities differed from item mean calculated from values obtained by the Business and Education communities for this trait. Participants from the Education group differed from the representatives of the Business group by .61 and by .42 from the Religious group. The mean differences were measured at .72 and .53 respectively. The item means of both the Education and Political communities had higher means on this trait with the Education representatives item mean being .72 (SD = .46) and the item mean of the Political group participants was .83 (SD = .40). Religious group representatives item mean was .30 (SD = .48) and the item mean of the Business group was .11 (SD = .33).

Competent. The item mean of the Education and Political communities were significantly higher than the other two groups for this trait. The item mean was 1.00 (SD = .63) for the Education participants and the item mean was .83 (SD = .40) for the Political representatives. The Religious participants item mean was .30 (SD = .48) and .11 (SD = .33) for the Business representatives. The item mean differences between the Education participants and the representatives of the Business and Religious community were found to be significant at the .003 and .000 levels. The item mean differences for the Political participants between the representatives of the same two Business and Religious communities were measured at .009 and .045 level of significance.

Loyal. Item mean obtained by the Education and Political communities were identical. Both groups assigned scores that resulted in item mean of 1.00 (SD = .44, .00). Representatives of the Business and Religious groups' scores resulted in significantly different item means. The

Religious community's scores resulted in an item mean of .30 (SD = .48) and the Business community's scores resulted in an item mean of .11 (SD = .33). Differences were found to be significant between the Education group and the Religious and Business groups at the .000 levels. The item mean differences for both the Religious and Business representatives were significant at the .000 and .002 from the Political participants.

Courageous. The Political participants item mean was significantly higher than the item mean obtained from the values assigned by the Religious and Business representatives. The item mean difference between the Political representatives and the Religious group was .86, which was significant at the .004 level. The .83 item mean difference between the Political representatives and the Business participants was significant at the .007 level. The values assigned by the representatives of the Political group resulted in an item mean of 1.16 (SD = .40) that was significantly higher than the item mean of .33 (SD = .70) obtained from the values assigned by the members of the Business participants. The Religious representatives item mean was lower at .30 (SD = .48).

Accessible. The Education and Political participants' item values resulted in a higher item mean than the item mean calculated from the values assigned by members of the Business and Religious representatives. The differences between the item mean of the Education participants and the item mean of the Business and Religious representatives were .60 and .79 respectively. The differences between the Political participant's item mean and the item mean of the Business and Religious representatives were .72 and .53 respectively. The Education representative's item mean was the highest with a mean of .90 (SD = .53) followed by the Political participants item mean of .83 (SD = .40). The lowest item mean belonged to the

Business representatives with a mean of .11 (SD = .33). The Religious participant's item mean was .30 (SD = .48).

Puts Others First. The representative's item mean that was significantly higher for this trait was the Political group. The Political community had an item mean of .83 (SD = .40). The difference between the item mean obtained by the Political participants and the Religious representatives was .53, which was significant at the .029 level. The difference between the Political representative's item mean and the item mean obtained by the Business participants was .72. This was significant at the .005 level.

Tactful. The item mean of the Political and Educational representatives were significantly higher than the item mean of the Business and the Religious participants. In addition, the Political communities item mean of 1.50 (SD = 1.22) was significantly higher than the .81 item mean (SD = .40) of the Education participants. The item mean of the Religious representatives was .30 (SD = .48). This resulted in an item mean difference between the Religious and the Political representatives of 1.20. The item mean of the Business participants was .11 (SD = .33). The difference between the item mean of the Business representatives and the Political participants was 1.38.

Adaptable / Anticipates Trends. The item mean of .11(SD = .33) obtained from the values assigned by the members of the Business community was significantly lower than the item mean of both the Educational and Political participants. The difference between the Business representatives item mean and the item mean calculated for the Education participants was .52 and .55 for the item mean obtained for the Political representatives. The level of significance with the item mean differences was measured at .017 and .030 respectively.

Cooperative. The item means of the four groups obtained for this trait were layered in such a way that the top score of the Education participants was significantly higher than the scores of the two lowest scores, which were obtained by the Religious and Business communities. The item mean of the Political representatives was significantly higher than the lowest item mean, that belonging to the Business participants. The item means are as follows. Educational community, .81 (SD = .40), Political community, .66 (SD = .51), Religious community, .30 (SD = .48), and Business community, .11 (SD = .33).

Punctual. The item mean by the Business representatives of .11 (SD = .33) was significantly lower than the item means of both the Political and Education participants. These communities valued this trait more by having a item means of .72 (SD = .46) by the Education representatives and 1.00 (SD = .00) by the Political participants.

Patient. The Political and Educational participants' item means were significantly higher than the item means of the Business and Religious representatives. The item mean differences between the Education participants and the other two communities were .59 and .51 respectively. This was significant at the .005 and .011 levels respectively. The item mean differences between the Political participants and the Business and Religious representatives were .94 and .86 respectively. These item mean differences were significant at the .000 and .001 levels. The Political representatives item mean was 1.16 (SD = .40). The Education participants item mean was .81 (SD = .40).

Thorough. The item mean of 1.00 (SD = .00) by the Political participants was significantly higher than the scores of the other three groups. The next highest item mean was obtained from the values assigned by the Education representatives, .54 (SD = .52). The other two

communities' item means were close together with the Business representative's mean being .22 (SD = .44) and the Religious participant's mean being .20 (SD = .42).

Financially Savvy. The item means of the Political and Education communities were significantly higher than those of the Business and Religious communities. The Political participants had the highest item mean of 1.00 (SD = .00). The Education representatives was somewhat lower at .72 (SD = .46). The Business participants item mean of .11 (SD = .33) was lowest with the Religious representative's item mean of .30 (SD = .48) next lowest. The item mean differences between the Political participants and the other three communities were significant at the .000, .045, and .002 levels.

Expertise In the Field. The item mean of the Political and Education participants, 1.00 (SD. 00) and .72 (SD= .46) respectively, again were significantly higher than those of the Business and Religious representatives, .11 (SD=.33) and .30 (SD=.48) respectively. The item mean differences and levels of significance are identical as the previous trait. Each group equally valued this trait as they did Financial Savvy.

Based on these findings, the general research hypothesis, H02<sub>2</sub> was rejected.

### Summary

This chapter contained the analysis of the data used to determine the relative importance of the characteristics and traits. The method of distribution of the survey materials and return rates were discussed. The traits were reorganized according to the new totals that were reached through this iteration. The traits were analyzed by groups to determine the level of agreement concerning the traits. Those traits where there were significant disagreements between the groups were pointed out and discussed.



Chapter 7 contains the discussion of the analysis and conclusions of the study. Recommendations for practice and for further study are also included.

## CHAPTER 7

### INTERPRETATION, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### Review of the Study

Chapters 1-3 contained a description of the method by which the Delphi Technique was used in this study. This included the applications, criteria for use, as well as the criteria for selecting the Delphi panel. Chapter 4 contained a discussion of the selection of the Delphi panel and the analysis of Round One. In Round One, members of the panel were asked two open-ended questions concerning the panel's opinion on the qualities of an ethical leader and the traits of successful leaders. Panelists listed traits and qualities they believed were connected with the questions of ethical characteristics of a successful individual and leadership traits of a successful individual. Chapter 5 contained a description of the procedures used in Round Two, which was a compilation of those characteristics that were generated from the responses of the two open ended questions in Round One. Panelists were then asked to assign values to the characteristics using a constant sum scale. The results and analysis were also included in Chapter 5. Chapter 6 contained the Round Three iteration, which was a continuation of the study designed to reach consensus with the groups. Panelists were asked to again assign values to characteristics that had been prioritized based on the results of Round Two. Panelists were able to see the item mean for each trait in Round Two and change those values using a constant sum scale. The results and analysis of Round Three was also contained in Chapter 6.

The questionnaire that was used in both Round Two and Round Three was constructed from characteristics that were listed by panel member during Round One. Panel members later assigned values to the 50 ethical qualities using a constant sum of 50. The 60 leadership qualities

were assigned values using the constant sum of 60. The more important a panelist considered a trait to be, the more points he/she assigned to it. Analysis of the data revealed that the panel expressed agreement in varying degrees concerning the relative importance of the characteristics.

This chapter develops those opinions of the Delphi panel concerning the ethical characteristics of successful individuals and leadership traits of successful individuals into conclusions and recommendations for further research for individuals wishing to extend this study. This study was designed to show the opinions of leaders in their particular fields as to what they considered to be the characteristics of an ethical leader. It was also designed to determine if there were any significant differences in the opinions of leaders based on the group they represented.

#### Research Question One Conclusions

What are the characteristics and traits of ethical leadership as identified by leaders from business, education, political, and religious organizations? According to the Delphi panel brought together for this study, the most important characteristic needed to be an ethical leader is Integrity. The item mean for this characteristic was nearly two points higher than the item mean of the other traits. Eighteen traits were given a value of 1 or more. The scores of nine of the characteristics were 2 or more and five of the nine received a score of 3 or more. The clustering of the 18 characteristics into three different groups (those receiving item mean of 3 or above, those receiving item mean of 2 or above, and those receiving item mean of 1 or higher) indicates that the panelists even considered certain characteristics more important inside the top level. The scores indicated that it was the panel's opinion that to be an ethical individual there are 18 characteristics that should be present. Attention should be focused on the following five

characteristics, which are characteristics that received item mean of 3 or above; Integrity, Following Biblical Principles of Behavior, Honest / Truthful, High Moral Standards / Firm Convictions, and being Fair / Unbiased.

Analysis of the values assigned my members of the Delphi panel revealed the traits an individual should possess to be a successful leader. According to their responses, the most important characteristic to possess to be a successful leader is to lead by example. This trait's item mean was nearly two points higher than the item mean obtained on the next highest trait. Nineteen characteristics received a score of 1 or higher. Of those 19, 9 received a score of 2 or higher and 7 scored a 3 or higher. Again, the scores indicate that it is the panel's opinion, that even though 19 characteristics stand above the rest, the cluster of the scores into three groups (those having item means of 3 or above, those having item means of 2 or above, and those having item means of 1 or higher) indicates that there are 7 characteristics that are valued above the rest. While all 19 characteristics are indicative of a successful leader a focus should be made on the following 7 characteristics, which are characteristics that received item mean of 3 or above; Lead by example, Develop an Atmosphere of Trust, Honest / Truthful, Involve Others in Decision Making, Team Builder, Good Communicator / Articulate, Creates a Vision for Others to Follow.

The traits and characteristics that were pointed out in this study were similar to the traits and characteristics that were pointed out in previous studies. The eight core ethical values pointed out by Lichtman (1998) included loyalty, honesty, fairness, caring, respect, tolerance, duty, and moral courage. Those ethical characteristics were all represented in this study. This study was able to prioritize this list and well as other characteristics and determine to what extent

they were valued. Honesty, for example, was considered to be one of the top three traits according to the item mean assigned by the panel.

The characteristic of Leads by Example was considered to be the top trait according to the item mean assigned by the Delphi panel. This would be in agreement with what the research had said previously. Brenner and Molander (1977) had stated that what influenced individuals behavior the most was the behavior of the supervisor.

Interestingly, for the bottom scoring traits, there was no research or data to support that to be an ethical person you need to make a decision and stick by it or to be a successful leader one must be obedient. The researchers opinion is that this realization adds to the strength of that values that were assigned by the members of the Delphi panel.

The researcher would like to note the high score that characteristics such as Follows Biblical Principles of Behavior may be indicative of the geographic region in which the study was conducted. That same characteristic may not have received the same level of scoring had the study been conducted in another, perhaps more metropolitan, region.

#### Research Question Two Conclusions

Are there differences in the ratings of ethical leadership characteristics and traits, based on the type of organization that the leader represents? The analysis of data revealed that there was a great deal of consensus between groups concerning the ethical and leadership traits to which they were asked to assign values. However, there were 5 traits out of the 50 for which significant differences were identified through data analysis. This means that the four groups were in agreement with the level of relative importance for 90% of the traits listed. The level of agreement between the groups was not as high in their consideration of the leadership traits.

There were 16 leadership traits for which the data indicated significant differences between groups. This indicates that the groups were in agreement with the level of relative importance for 74% of the leadership characteristics.

The researcher found the results to this question to be somewhat surprising. Entering into the study, the researcher anticipated finding there to be greater differences between the groups that were reported. The religious groups were anticipated to assign greater values to many of the ethical traits than the other groups. The researcher attempts to explain the scores of the four groups being closely related on most traits as being related to the culture of the region. The Upper East Tennessee region is considered to be a conservative area of Tennessee and many are involved in religious activities.

The researcher has learned that individuals from this region have higher standards of a leader and his or her ethics than was anticipated. It would be important for an individual to attempt to practice and develop many of the skills and traits that were listed in the study to be successful in this six county area of Upper East Tennessee.

### Recommendations for Further Research

As a result of this study, the following recommendations are offered for consideration. A study is recommended to determine a uniform definition of the term ethical. Ethical can mean different things to different groups. An individual might approach the term as one who follows the rules, while another individual might approach the topic from a more moral perspective . Responses might vary depending on the meaning of the term for each individual. It would be useful to survey specific organizations to determine what characteristics they look for in promoting individuals into leadership positions. This would help to determine the degree to

which, or if, ethical qualities are considered when promoting individuals and for which positions ethical qualities are considered.

It would be informative to assemble a Delphi panel of individuals throughout America and repeat this study so as to compare the opinions of leaders in Upper East Tennessee with the opinions of individuals from other regions of the country in an effort to determine if the traits and characteristics identified in this study are universally valued.

The time has passed when organizations can only look at the technical abilities of an individual when filling key leadership positions. Technical ability helps a person perform his job correctly. Ethical ability helps one to know if he/she is doing the right and proper job for the organization. This makes the selection of a leader an important task because both technical and ethical abilities must now be considered. It is research like this that provides information to those who must select future leaders, help in making the selection of such individuals an undaunting process.

The findings indicate that many of the characteristics that were identified in the study, such as Integrity and Being free from prejudice, are of the sort that they represent behaviors that have been developed over a lifetime and not through a seminar or class. The importance of finding individuals within one's organization that display these key ethical traits and working to develop the technical abilities of these people to fill key positions is of paramount importance in developing an ethical culture or organization.

The researcher suggests that individuals currently holding key leadership positions must make efforts to fulfill these ethical duties for their constituents. It is as Dobel (1998) suggested that all leadership is a moral and ethical issue because people in leadership positions can create change that no one else can. Those ethical areas that an individual may lack in must be

developed, though not the most efficient way, through class work, training, and personal development.



## REFERENCES

- Adams, J. S., Shore, T. H., & Tashian, A. (2001). Codes of ethics as signals for ethical behavior. *Journal of Business Ethics, 29*, 199-211.
- Barnard, C. (1968). *The functions of the executive*. Boston: Harvard University Press.
- Barrett, W. M., & Rowe, B. (1994, November). What's wrong with America and can anything be done about it? *USA Today*, 18-21.
- Beck, L. G. (1996, October). Why ethics? Why now? *AASA- School Administrator*
- Beck, L. G., & Murphy, J. (1993, October). *Preparing ethical leaders: Overviewing current efforts and analyzing forces that have shaped them*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the University Council for Educational Administration, Houston, TX. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 364 936).
- Bennett, W. J. (1994, November) America at risk: Can we survive without moral values? *USA Today* 14-17.
- Bennett, W. J. (1999). *The index of leading cultural indicators: American society at the end of the 20<sup>th</sup> century*. Colorado Springs, CO: Waterbrook Press.
- Bennis, W. (1989). *Why leaders can't lead*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Bennis, W., & Nanus, B. (1985). *Leaders: The strategies for taking charge* New York: Harper & Row.
- Bethel, S. M. (1999, July) A leader has high ethics. *Food Management*, 34, 36-40.
- Bird, F., & Waters, J. A. (1987). The nature of managerial moral standards. *Journal of Business Ethics, 6*, 1-13.
- Bloom, A. J. (1987). *The closing of the American mind*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Brenner, S. N., & Molander, E. A. (1977, January-February) Is the ethics of business changing? *Harvard Business Review, 55*, 57-71.
- Burns, J. (1978). *Leadership* New York: Harper & Row.
- Butcher, W. C. (1987). The need for ethical leadership. *Executive Speeches, 6*, (3), 55-58.
- Cairns, D. V. (1995). *Research report: Critical skills necessary for Montana principals*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 390 822).

- Calabrese, R. L. (1988, December). Ethical leadership: A prerequisite for effective schools. *NASSP Bulletin*, 72, (512), 1-4.
- Campbell, E. (1997). Ethical school leadership: Problems for an elusive role. *Journal of School Leadership*, 7, (4), 287-300.
- Carter, S. L. (1996). *Integrity*. New York: Basic Books.
- Caudron, S. (1993, November 15). Motivation. *Industry Week*, 33.
- Ciulla, B. (1998). *Ethics: The heart of leadership*. Westport, CT: Quorum Books.
- Costa, D. (1998). *The ethical imperative: Why moral leadership is good business*. Reading, MA: Addison-Wesley.
- Covey, S. (1991). *Principle centered leadership*. New York: Simon & Schuster.
- Coye, R. (1986). Individual values and business ethics. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 5, 45-49.
- Crain, W.C. (1985). *Theories of Development*. Prentice-Hall.
- Creighton, (1999) Spirituality and the new principalship: Leadership for the new millennium. *International Electronic Journal for Leadership in Learning*. 3 (11). Retrieved March 28, 2001 from the World Wide Web: <http://www.ucalgary.ca/~iejll>
- Crowson, R. (1989). Managerial ethics in educational administration: The rational choice approach. *Urban Education*, 23 (4), 412-435.
- Cyphert, F. R., & Gant, W.L. (1971, January). The delphi technique: A case study. *Phi Delta Kappan*. 272-273.
- Czaja, M., & Lowe, J. (2000, Fall). Preparing leaders for ethical decisions. *The AASA Professor*, 24, (1), 7-12.
- Delattre, E. J., & Russell, W. E. (1993). Schooling, moral principles, and the formation of character. *Journal of Education*, 175, (2), 23-43.
- Delbecq, A. L., Van de Ven, A. H., & Gustafson, D. H. (1975). *Group techniques for program planning*. Glenview, IL: Scott-Foresman.
- Depree, M. (1989). *Leadership is an art*. New York: Doubleday.
- Dobel, J. P. (1998, January-February). Political prudence and the ethics of leadership. *Public Administration Review*. 74-89.
- Dreilinger, D. (1998, August) Get real- and ethics will follow. *Workforce*, 77, (8), 101-102.

- Driscoll, D. M., & Hoffman, W. M. (1997). Spot the red flags in your organization. *Workforce*, 76, (6), 135-139.
- Etzioni, A. (1996). *The new golden rule: Community and morality in a democratic society*. New York: Basic Books.
- Fandray, D. (2000, December). The ethical company. *Workforce*, 79, (12), 74-77.
- Fenstermaker, W. C. (1996). The ethical dimension of superintendent decision making: A case study of AASA members finds a lack of awareness or understanding *AASA- School Administrator*, 53, (8), 1-6.
- Flynn, G. (1995, June). Make employee ethics your business. *Personnel Journal*, 74, (6), 30-41.
- Ford, R. C., & Richardson, W. D. (1994). Ethical decision making: A review of the empirical literature. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 13, 205-221.
- Frankena, W. (1963). *Ethics*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Gaedeke, R. M., Kelley, C. A., & Tootelian, D. H. (1992). Business students perceptions of ethics in marketing. *Journal of Education for Business*, 67, 294-299.
- Gardner, J. W. (1990). *On leadership*. New York: Free Press.
- Gini, A. (1996). Moral leadership and business ethics. University of Maryland: James MacGregor Burns Academy of Leadership. Retrieved March 28, 2001 from the World Wide Web: [http://academy.umd.edu/scholarship/casl/klspdocs/agini\\_p1.htm](http://academy.umd.edu/scholarship/casl/klspdocs/agini_p1.htm)
- Gordon, T. J. (1992, July). The methods of futures research. *The Annals of the American Academy of Political and Social Science*, 522, 25-35.
- Gray, S. T. (1996, December). Avoiding on the edge ethical choices. *Association Management*, 48, (13), 112.
- Greenfield, W. D. (1991, April). *Rationale and methods to articulate ethics and administrator training*. Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association, Chicago, Ill. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 332 379).
- Greenfield, W. D. (1985, Fall). The moral socialization of school administrators: Informal role learning outcomes. *Educational Administration Quarterly*, 21, (4), 99-119.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1977) *Servant leadership: A journey into the nature of legitimate power and greatness*. New York: Paulist Press.
- Hackworth, M. (1999). Only the ethical survive. *Issues in Ethics*, 10, (2), 1-5.

- Hitt, W. D. (1990). *Ethics and leadership: Putting theory into practice*. Columbus, OH: Battelle Press.
- Hodgkinson, C. (1991). *Educational leadership: The moral art*. Albany: State University of New York Press.
- Howell, J. M., & Avolio, B. J. (1995). Charismatic leadership: Submission or liberation? *Business Quarterly*, 60, 62-71.
- Hudson, J. (1997). Ethical leadership: The soul of policy making. *Journal of School Leadership*, 7, (5), 506-520.
- Holifield, M. (1990, November). *The straight and narrow way: Realizations and precepts for the ethical administrator*. Paper presented at the Southern Regional Council on Educational Administration, Atlanta, GA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 328 978).
- Institute for Global Ethics (1996, October) Global value, moral boundaries: A pilot survey. Camden, ME. Retrieved April 19, 2001 from the World Wide Web: <http://www.globalethics.org/gvs/summary.html>
- Institute for Global Ethics (1998, May 11). Public policy statistics. Camden, ME. Retrieved April 19, 2001 from the World Wide Web: <http://www.globalethics.org/public/statistics.html>
- Institute for Global Ethics (1999, December 15). Campaign Conduct Survey. Camden, ME. Retrieved April 19, 2001 from the World Wide Web: <http://www.campaignconduct.org/polling-body.html>
- Johns, T. (1995). Don't be afraid of the moral maze. *People Management*, 1, (20), 32-40.
- Jones, H. B. (1995). The ethical leader: An ascetic construct. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 14, 867-874.
- Joseph, J. (2000). National business ethics survey. Ethics Resource Center. Retrieved March 28, 2001 from the World Wide Web: [http://www.ethics.org/nbes\\_summ.html](http://www.ethics.org/nbes_summ.html)
- Josephson, M. (2001). Making ethical decisions. Josephson Institute of Ethics. Marina del Rey, CA. Retrieved April 30, 2001 from the World Wide Web: <http://www.josephsoninstitute.org/MED/medtoc.htm>
- Kelly, D. J. (1990). Ethics: The tone at the top. *Management Accounting*, 70, (10), 18-19.
- Koestenbaum, P. (1991). *Leadership: The inner side of greatness*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

- Kouzes, J., & Posner, B. (1993). *Credibility: How leaders gain and lose it, why people demand it*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kouzes, J., & Posner, B. (1995). *The leadership challenge: How to keep getting extraordinary things done in organizations*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Kotter, J. (1988). *The leadership factor*. New York: Free Press.
- Lashway, L. (1996). Ethical leadership. *ERIC Digest 107*. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 397463)
- Lewis, P. V. (1985). Business ethics: Like nailing jello to a wall. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 4, 377-383.
- Lichtman, J. (1998). Invoke employee loyalty. *Workforce*, 77, (1), 121-122.
- Linstone, H. A., & Turoff, M. (1975). *The Delphi method: Techniques and applications*. Boston: Addison-Wesley.
- Markkula Center for Applied Ethics (2001). What is Ethics? Santa Clara University. Retrieved June 7, 2001 from the World Wide Web: <http://www.scu.edu/SCU/Centers/Ethics/practicing/decision/whatisethics.shtml>
- Marshall, C. (1992). School administrators values: A focus on atypicals. *Education Administration Quarterly*, 28, (3), 368-386.
- McDonald, M. (2001). A framework for ethical decision-making: Version 6.0 ethics shareware. University of British Columbia: Center for Applied Ethics. Retrieved June 22, 2001 from the World Wide Web: <http://www.ethics.ubc.ca/mcdonald/decisions.html>
- McKerrow, K. (1997). Ethical administration: An oxymoron? *Journal of School Leadership*, 7, 210-225.
- Messick, D. M., & Bazerman, M. H. (1996, Winter). Ethical leadership and the psychology of decision making. *Sloan Management Review*, 37, (2), 9-23.
- Metropolitan Life Survey of the American Teacher (1999). Violence in America's public schools – five years later. Metropolitan Life. Retrieved April 19, 2001 from the World Wide Web: <http://www.metlife.com/Companyinfo/Community/Found/Docs/99pdf.html>
- Milgram, S. (1974). *Obedience to authority*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Miller-Forester, H., & Davis, T. (1996). A practitioner's guide to ethical decision making. American Counseling Association. Retrieved April 30, 2001 from the World Wide Web: <http://www.conseling.org/resources/pracguide.htm>

- O'Reilly, C. O. (1989). Corporations, culture, and commitment: Motivation and social control of organizations. *California Management Review*, 31, (4), 9-25.
- Paquet, G. (1996, Summer). Ethics, leadership and the military. *Optimum*, 27, 47-54.
- Partnership Attitude Tracking Study (1999). Teens in grades 7 through 12. Partnership for a Drug-Free America. Retrieved April 19, 2001 from the World Wide Web: <http://www.drugfreeamerica.org>
- Peters, T., & Waterman, R. (1982). *In search of excellence*. New York: Harper & Row.
- Posner, B. Z., & Schmidt, W. H. (1984). Values and the American manager: An update. *California Management Review*, 26, 202-216.
- Posner, B. Z., & Schmidt, W. H. (1987). Ethics in American companies: A managerial perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 6, 383-391.
- Posner, B. Z., & Schmidt, W. H. (1993). Values congruence and differences between the interplay of personal and organizational value systems. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 12, 171-177.
- Putnam, J. W., Spiegel, A. N., & Bruininks, R. H. (1995). Future directions in education and inclusion of students with disabilities: A Delphi investigation. *Exceptional Children*, 61, 553-576.
- Rae, S. B. (1995). *Moral choices: An introduction to ethics*. Grand Rapids: Zondervan.
- Randal, D. M., & Gibson, A. M. (1990). Methodology in business ethics research: A review and critical assessment. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 9, 457-471.
- Rokeach, M. (1973) *The nature of human values*. New York: Free Press.
- Russo, J. E., & Schoemaker, P. (1990). *Decision traps: Ten barriers to brilliant decision-making and how to overcome them*. New York: Fireside.
- Ryan, K. (1993). Why a center for the advancement of ethics and character? *Journal of Education*, 175, (2), 1-11.
- Scaranti, J. T. (1994, April). Beyond technical competence: Nine rules for administrators. *NASSP Bulletin*, 78, 76-83.
- Schmidt, W., & Posner, B. (1983). *Managerial values in perspective*. New York: American Managerial Association.
- Sergiovanni, T. (1990a). *Value-added leadership* San Diego: Harcourt Brace Jovanovich.

- Sergiovanni, T. (1990b) Adding value to leadership gets extraordinary results. *Educational Leadership*, 7, 23-27.
- Sergiovanni, T. (1992). *Moral leadership: Getting to the heart of school improvement*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Sharples, B. (1984, Fall). Values: The forgotten dimension in administration. *Education Canada*, 32-37.
- Shaw, W. H., & Barry, V. (1995). *Moral Issues in Business*. Belmont, CA: Wadsworth.
- Sherman, N. (1989). *The fabric of character: Aristotle's theory of virtue*. Oxford, England: Clarendon Press.
- Srivista, S. (1988). *Executive integrity: The search for the high human values in executive life*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Stout, R. (1986, Winter). Executive action and values. *Issues in Education*, 4, 198-214.
- Trautman, N. (2000, May) How organizations become corrupt: The corruption continuum. *Law and Order*, 48, (5), 65-68.
- Tong, R. (1986). *Ethics in policy analysis*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Velasquez, M., Andre, A., Shanks, T. & Meyer, J. M. (2001). Thinking ethically: A framework for moral decision making. Santa Clara University: Markkula Center for Applied Ethics. Retrieved June 7, 2001 from the World Wide Web: <http://www.scu.edu/SCU/Centers/Ethics/practicing/decision/thinking.shtml>
- Walker Information National Study (2001) Ethics culture within the workplace. Retrieved March 28, 2001 from the World Wide Web: [http://www.mta.net/corporate/depts/ethics/Headlines/headlines/ethics\\_culture.htm](http://www.mta.net/corporate/depts/ethics/Headlines/headlines/ethics_culture.htm)
- Walker, K. (1993). Striving for integrity in educational policy making: An ethical metaphor. *The McGill Journal of Education*, 28, (1), 77-95.
- Walker, K. (1995). Perceptions of ethical problems among senior educational leaders. *Journal of School Leadership*, 5, (6), 532-564.
- Watson, C. E. (1991). *Managing with integrity: Insights from America's CEOs*. New York: Praeger.
- West. S. (1993). *Educational values for school leadership*. London: Kogan Page.
- Yates, A. C. (1996). Good leaders must first be good people. *Black Issues in Higher Education*, 13, (9), 64.

## APPENDIX A

### Points Of Referrals

#### Johnson County

County Executive - Curtis Sluder

Director of Schools - Minnie Miller

Director of Chamber of Commerce - Kevin Parsons

Minister - Dewayne Dixon

#### Unicoi County

County Executive - Paul Monk

Director of Schools - Dr. John Payne

Director of Chamber of Commerce - Ammanda Bennett Hensley

Minister - Bruce Shawver

#### Carter County

County Executive - Truman Clarke

Director of Schools - Dallas Williams

Director of Chamber of Commerce - Barbara Treadway

Minister - Don Marshall

#### Greene County

County Executive - Alan Broyles

Director of Schools - Dr. Joe Parkins

Director of Chamber of Commerce - Gary Farlow

Minister - Charles Reece



Washington County

County Executive - George Jaynes

Director of Schools - Grant Rowland

Director of Chamber of Commerce - Gary Mabrey

Minister - Aaron Wymer

Sullivan County

County Executive - Gil Hodges

Director of Schools - Dr. John O'Dell

Director of Chamber of Commerce - Miles Burdine

Minister - Richard Carpenter

APPENDIX B

Referral Letter

Jeff Moorhouse  
January 18, 2002

Dear Sir or Madame,

Hello, My name is Jeff Moorhouse. I am a doctoral student at East Tennessee State University. To complete my degree, I am doing a dissertation on the Characteristics of Ethical Leadership. You have been identified as the leader of your organization. I am seeking to establish a panel of experts whose purpose will be to reach consensus concerning the characteristics of an ethical leader as perceived by members of the business, religious, political, and educational communities in the six counties of upper East Tennessee. This consensus will be reached through a series of questionnaires. The results will assist in the research for a doctoral dissertation. I believe that the results will be helpful to our community leaders in developing future leaders for our area.

I am requesting that you nominate political leaders in the field from your county who you believe would have an interest in this topic or who have information to share to serve on this panel. It would be beneficial if these individuals would be considered ethical leaders themselves.

I have enclosed a nomination form and a self- addressed stamp envelope for your reply. Please return the nomination form in the provided envelope by January 29, 2002. If you have any further questions, you may contact me.

Sincerely,

Jeff Moorhouse

Jeff Moorhouse  
January 18, 2002

Dear Sir or Madame,

Hello, My name is Jeff Moorhouse. I am a doctoral student at East Tennessee State University. To complete my degree, I am doing a dissertation on the Characteristics of Ethical Leadership. You have been identified as the leader of your organization. I am seeking to establish a panel of experts whose purpose will be to reach consensus concerning the characteristics of an ethical leader as perceived by members of the business, religious, political, and educational communities in the six counties of upper East Tennessee. This consensus will be reached through a series of questionnaires. The results will assist in the research for a doctoral dissertation. I believe that the results will be helpful to our community leaders in developing future leaders for our area.

I am requesting that you nominate business leaders in the field from your county who you believe would have an interest in this topic or who have information to share to serve on this panel. It would be beneficial if these individuals would be considered ethical leaders themselves.

I have enclosed a nomination form and a self- addressed stamp envelope for your reply. Please return the nomination form in the provided envelope by January 29, 2002. If you have any further questions, you may contact me.

Sincerely,

Jeff Moorhouse

Jeff Moorhouse  
January 18, 2002

Dear Sir or Madame,

Hello, My name is Jeff Moorhouse. I am a doctoral student at East Tennessee State University. To complete my degree, I am doing a dissertation on the Characteristics of Ethical Leadership. You have been identified as the leader of your organization. I am seeking to establish a panel of experts whose purpose will be to reach consensus concerning the characteristics of an ethical leader as perceived by members of the business, religious, political, and educational communities in the six counties of upper East Tennessee. This consensus will be reached through a series of questionnaires. The results will assist in the research for a doctoral dissertation. I believe that the results will be helpful to our community leaders in developing future leaders for our area.

I am requesting that you nominate religious leaders in the field from your county who you believe would have an interest in this topic or who have information to share to serve on this panel. It would be beneficial if these individuals would be considered ethical leaders themselves.

I have enclosed a nomination form and a self- addressed stamp envelope for your reply. Please return the nomination form in the provided envelope by January 29, 2002. If you have any further questions, you may contact me.

Sincerely,

Jeff Moorhouse

Jeff Moorhouse  
January 18, 2002

Dear Sir or Madame,

Hello, My name is Jeff Moorhouse. I am a doctoral student at East Tennessee State University. To complete my degree, I am doing a dissertation on the Characteristics of Ethical Leadership. You have been identified as the leader of your organization. I am seeking to establish a panel of experts whose purpose will be to reach consensus concerning the characteristics of an ethical leader as perceived by members of the business, religious, political, and educational communities in the six counties of upper East Tennessee. This consensus will be reached through a series of questionnaires. The results will assist in the research for a doctoral dissertation. I believe that the results will be helpful to our community leaders in developing future leaders for our area.

I am requesting that you nominate educational leaders in the field from your county who you believe would have an interest in this topic or who have information to share to serve on this panel. It would be beneficial if these individuals would be considered ethical leaders themselves.

I have enclosed a nomination form and a self- addressed stamp envelope for your reply. Please return the nomination form in the provided envelope by January 29, 2002. If you have any further questions, you may contact me.

Sincerely,

Jeff Moorhouse

Nomination Form

Please nominate individuals in your field indicating the organization with which they are affiliated and the city of the organization's location.

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Organization \_\_\_\_\_

Address (If Known) \_\_\_\_\_

Phone (If Known) \_\_\_\_\_

E-mail (If Known) \_\_\_\_\_

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Organization \_\_\_\_\_

Address (If Known) \_\_\_\_\_

Phone (If Known) \_\_\_\_\_

E-mail (If Known) \_\_\_\_\_

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Organization \_\_\_\_\_

Address (If Known) \_\_\_\_\_

Phone (If Known) \_\_\_\_\_

E-mail (If Known) \_\_\_\_\_

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Organization \_\_\_\_\_

Address (If Known) \_\_\_\_\_

Phone (If Known) \_\_\_\_\_

E-mail (If Known) \_\_\_\_\_

Name \_\_\_\_\_ Organization \_\_\_\_\_

Address (If Known) \_\_\_\_\_

Phone (If Known) \_\_\_\_\_

E-mail (If Known) \_\_\_\_\_

## APPENDIX C

### Delphi Panel

#### Johnson County

Bob Graybeal - Political  
County Commission

Karen Reeseman - Business  
Safehaven

Margaret Wallace - Education  
Johnson County Schools

Bill Cahill - Religion  
Valley View United Methodist Church

#### Unicoi County

Dr. John Payne- Political  
Unicoi County Director of Schools

Larry Hatfield- Business  
Morril Motors

Denise Brown- Education  
Unicoi County Schools

Joel Tramel- Religion  
First Christian Church

#### Carter County

Harry Sisk- Political  
County Commission

Adeline Hyder-Political  
County Commission

Cleo Reed- Business  
WBEJ Radio

Ed Robinson- Business  
Moody Aviation

Pat Hicks- Education  
Carter County Schools

Peggy Campbell- Education  
Carter County Schools

Joel Stauffer- Religion  
East River Park Christian Church

Brent Seals- Religion  
First Baptist Church

Greene County

Eddie Yokley- Political  
Property Assessor

Joy Rader- Political  
Register of Deeds

Carlyle Walton- Business  
Takoma Hospital

Rebecca Cutshaw- Business  
Hunter, Smith and Davis

Judy Phillips- Education  
Greene County Schools

Yhona Jones- Education  
Greene County Schools

Robert Smith- Religion  
Trinity United Methodist Church

Dan Donaldson- Religion  
First Presbyterian Church

Washington County

Jack Daniels- Political  
Trustee

Ginger Jilton- Political  
Register of Deeds



Monty Treadway- Political  
Property Assessor

Jane Myron- Business  
At Your Service

John Abe Teague- Business  
Farm Bureau Insurance

Eric Deaton- Business  
Wellmont

Gene Loyd- Education  
Washington County Schools

Dr. Susan Keirman- Education  
Washington County Schools

Dr. Bill Flannary- Education  
Washington County Schools

Tim Ross- Religion  
Hopwood Christian Church

Robbie Phillips- Religion  
Harrison Christian Church

Dennis Wheeler- Religion  
Central Christian Church

#### Sullivan County

Mary Lou Duncan- Political  
Register of Deeds

Jeanette Blazier- Political  
Mayor- City of Kingsport

Sue Ojanen- Political  
Mayor- City of Bristol

Keith Wilson- Business  
Kingsport Times News

Doris Ladd- Business

AFG

Jeff Flemming- Business  
City of Kingsport

Katie Litz- Education  
Sullivan County Schools

Mary Rouse- Education  
Sullivan County Schools

Brenda Webb- Education  
Sullivan County Schools

Hugh Thompson- Religion  
Colonial Heights Christian Church

Wes Patten- Religion  
Crisis Pregnancy Shelter

Doug Tweed- Religion  
Mustard Seed Ministries

## APPENDIX D

### Notification of Informed Consent

Principal Investigator: Jeff Moorhouse

Title of Project: The Characteristics of Ethical Leadership: A Delphi Investigation

This Informed consent will explain about being a research subject in an experiment. It is important that you read this material carefully and then decide if you wish to be a volunteer.

**Purpose:** The purpose of this study is to gather information from experts in their given fields of education, religion, business, and politics to show what they consider to be the characteristics of an ethical leader and compare and contrast the perceptions of the groups. This information will be useful in the identification and training of future leaders of their communities.

**Duration:** This study is projected to continue for 45 days.

**Procedures:** Participants will be asked to respond to an initial questionnaire. The results will be grouped into categories or like responses. Participants will then have a chance to change responses or add ideas. In the third and final round of questionnaires the participants will assign value to each previously identified characteristic. The method of inquiry is called the Delphi Method.

**Possible Risks/Discomforts:** The only known discomforts for participation is an expected time commitment of approximately one hour total for completion of the three rounds of questionnaires.

**Possible Benefits/Compensation:** The possible benefits that could result from participation in this study is the increased reputation among ones peers from being identified as an ethical leader within ones field

**Contact for Questions:** If you have any questions, problems or research-related problems at any time, you may call Jeff Moorhouse at (xxx) xxx-xxxx or Dr. Louise MacKay at (xxx) xxx-xxxx. You may call the Chairman of the Institutional Review Board at (xxx) xxx-xxxx for any questions you may have about your rights as a research subject.

**Confidentiality:** Every attempt will be made to see that my study results are kept confidential. A copy of the records from this study will be stored in my home for at least 10 years after the end of this research. The results of this study may be published and/or presented at meetings without naming me as a subject. Although your rights and privacy will be maintained, the Secretary of the Institutional Review Board, the Food and Drug Administration, and the ETSU Department of Educational Leadership and Policy Analysis have access to the study records. My records will be kept completely confidential according to current legal requirements. They will not be revealed unless required by law, or as noted above.

**Compensation for medical treatment:** East Tennessee State University will pay the cost of emergency first aid for any injury which may happen as a result of your being in this study. They will not pay for any other medical treatment. Claims against ETSU or any of its agents or employees may be submitted to the Tennessee Claims Commission. These claims will be settled to the extent allowable as provided under TCA Section 9-8-307. For more information about claims call the Chairman of the Institutional Review Board of ETSU at (xxx) xxx-xxxx.

**Voluntary Participation:** The nature demands, risks, and benefits of the project have been explained to me as well as are known and available. I understand what my participation involves. Furthermore, I understand that I am free to ask questions and withdraw from the project at any time, without penalty. I have read, or have had read to me, and fully understand the consent form. I sign it freely and voluntarily. A signed copy has been given to me.

Your study record will be maintained in strictest confidence according to current legal requirements and will not be revealed unless required by law or as noted above.

---

Signature of Volunteer      Date

---

Signature of Investigator      Date

## APPENDIX E

### Round One Questionnaire And Instructions

Jeff Moorhouse  
December 1, 2001

Name  
Address  
Address

Dear Mr.:

Thank you for agreeing to participate on a panel of leaders who are being invited to engage in a study dealing with the characteristics of an ethical leader. The panel will be asked to complete three questionnaires in reaching consensus. The collective answers to the first questionnaire will be analyzed, grouped for consensus, and used to formulate the questions of the second questionnaire. The second and third questionnaire will be much shorter and take less time to complete. The entire process is projected to be completed by May 2002.

As I told you during our phone conversation, the results of these questionnaires will assist in the research for a doctoral dissertation. It is hoped that the results of these efforts will be helpful to leaders of organizations in the identification and development of future leaders in Upper East Tennessee.

I am sure you appreciate the fact that you were nominated to serve on this panel by a leader of your field. The panel membership is composed of a few select leaders in the fields of education, business, religion, and politics from the six county area of Upper East Tennessee. Your participation throughout the process is critical to its success.

Your individual responses to this voluntary survey will be kept anonymous and be used solely for data analysis. I will consider your return of the questionnaire to be informed consent to participate in the study. Additionally, the names of the participants will be published in the

dissertation. At the conclusion of the study, participants will be sent a courtesy copy of the final findings.

I have enclosed the following items: 1) a copy of the questionnaire for which consensus is desired; 2) informed consent form; 3) a schedule for questionnaires; and 4) a self-addressed stamped envelope for reply. Please return the questionnaire in the self-addressed stamped envelope to me by December 30, 2001. If you have any further questions, you may contact me by phone or e-mail.

If you have another address, other than the one that I am currently using and you would prefer it to be used for this study, please provide that information on your questionnaire.

Again, I appreciate your willingness to serve on this Delphi panel.

Sincerely,

Jeff Moorhouse

## Round One Questionnaire

As you prepare to answer the following questions please take time to answer fully with as much detail and description as possible to help provide meaningful profiles.

Thank You.

Picture in your mind a person that you believe to be an ethical leader and describe for me below:

1. What are the characteristics and traits that make this person an ethical leader?
2. What are the leadership qualities that make this person successful?

APPENDIX F

Round Two Questionnaire And Instructions

April 30, 2002

Dear Participant,

Thank you for your responses to the Round One questionnaire and for your patience. It is now time to begin Round Two. I have listed the responses given in the first questionnaire. In this round, you will be asked to assign a point value to each characteristic and be given a total number of which your points should not exceed. If, in your opinion, the characteristics are all equally important, give them each equal value. If, however, you think that only a few characteristics are important, use the points to assign value to the traits that you believe to be most important. Remember that the point total must not exceed the allotment for that question.

Example: This question is worth 5 points  
(These are four different scenarios)

A. <u>  </u> 1 <u>  </u> a	B. <u>  </u> 1 <u>  </u> a	C. <u>  </u> 0 <u>  </u> a	D. <u>  </u> 0 <u>  </u> a
<u>  </u> 1 <u>  </u> b	<u>  </u> 0 <u>  </u> b	<u>  </u> 0 <u>  </u> b	<u>  </u> 0 <u>  </u> b
<u>  </u> 1 <u>  </u> c	<u>  </u> 2 <u>  </u> c	<u>  </u> 0 <u>  </u> c	<u>  </u> 5 <u>  </u> c
<u>  </u> 1 <u>  </u> d	<u>  </u> 2 <u>  </u> d	<u>  </u> 4 <u>  </u> d	<u>  </u> 0 <u>  </u> d
<u>  </u> 1 <u>  </u> e	<u>  </u> 0 <u>  </u> e	<u>  </u> 1 <u>  </u> e	<u>  </u> 0 <u>  </u> e

Notice that in each scenario the total points equal five, but the responses may receive different values. The following will be two questions. Fifty points will be allotted for question one and sixty points will be allotted for question two.

If, for any reason, you are not sure what to do please e-mail me or call me. **Round Two should be returned by May 7<sup>th</sup>. Please help me by being prompt.**

Jeff Moorhouse



Question 1: 50 points

The Ethical Qualities of a Leader

- |                          |  |                          |  |
|--------------------------|--|--------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 1.Logical                                | <input type="checkbox"/> | 27.Follows Biblical principles of behavior |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 2.Energetic                              | <input type="checkbox"/> | 28.Makes decisions and sticks by them      |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 3.Resourceful                            | <input type="checkbox"/> | 29.Publicly recognizes the works of others |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 4.Attune to the changing needs of others | <input type="checkbox"/> | 30.High moral standards/Firm convictions   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 5.Honest                                 | <input type="checkbox"/> | 31.Courage in decision-making              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 6.Dependable                             | <input type="checkbox"/> | 32.Selfless/Puts others first              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 7.Maintains Confidentiality              | <input type="checkbox"/> | 33.Loyal                                   |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 8.Fair/Unbiased                          | <input type="checkbox"/> | 34.Straightforward                         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 9.Consistent                             | <input type="checkbox"/> | 35.Free from prejudice                     |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 10.Tactful                               | <input type="checkbox"/> | 36.Compassionate/Caring                    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 11.Good listener                         | <input type="checkbox"/> | 37.Volunteers in community                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 12.Delegates authority/Lets others lead  | <input type="checkbox"/> | 38.Courteous                               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 13.Priorities greater than work          | <input type="checkbox"/> | 39.Diplomatic                              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 14.Creates a safe working environment    | <input type="checkbox"/> | 40.Knows right from wrong                  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 15.Empathetic/Sympathetic                | <input type="checkbox"/> | 41.Diligent                                |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 16.Strong character                      | <input type="checkbox"/> | 42.Authentic                               |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 17.Mature                                | <input type="checkbox"/> | 43.Courageous                              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 18.Wise/Common Sense                     | <input type="checkbox"/> | 44.Introspective/Reflective thinker        |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 19.Risk taker                            | <input type="checkbox"/> | 45.Defends those less fortunate            |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 20.Persistent                            | <input type="checkbox"/> | 46.Passionate                              |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 21.Goes the extra mile                   | <input type="checkbox"/> | 47.Lacks duplicity                         |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 22.Integrity                             | <input type="checkbox"/> | 48.Patient                                 |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 23.Does things in a timely manner        | <input type="checkbox"/> | 49.Disciplined                             |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 24.Strives to serve                      | <input type="checkbox"/> | 50.Continually learning                    |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 25.Obeys the rules                       |                          |  |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | 26.Goal oriented                         |                          |  |

Question 2: 60 points

Leadership Qualities of Successful

Individuals

- |     |  |     |                                       |
|-----|--|-----|---------------------------------------|
| ___ | 1.Weighs options before making a decision.   | ___ | 38.Strong work ethic                  |
| ___ | 2.Reputation of past leadership              | ___ | 39.Cooperative                        |
| ___ | 3.Prioritizes goals based on needs           | ___ | 40.Delegates authority                |
| ___ | 4.Involves others in decisions               | ___ | 41.Empathetic/Sympathetic             |
| ___ | 5.Develops an atmosphere of trust            | ___ | 42.Task oriented                      |
| ___ | 6.Good communicator/Articulate               | ___ | 43.Optimistic                         |
| ___ | 7.Expertise in the field                     | ___ | 44.Calm under stress                  |
| ___ | 8.Keeps current with research                | ___ | 45.Punctual                           |
| ___ | 9.Organized                                  | ___ | 46.Perseveres                         |
| ___ | 10.Well rounded                              | ___ | 47.Patient                            |
| ___ | 11.Leads by example                          | ___ | 48.Courageous                         |
| ___ | 12.Seeks first to understand/ Asks questions | ___ | 49.Thorough                           |
| ___ | 13.Practices the golden rule                 | ___ | 50.Accessible                         |
| ___ | 14.Financially savvy                         | ___ | 51.Knowledge of organization          |
| ___ | 15.Hires the best people possible            | ___ | 52.Publicly recognizes work of others |
| ___ | 16.Creates a vision for other to follow      | ___ | 53.Foster growth in others/ Mentors   |
| ___ | 17.Competitive spirit                        | ___ | 54.Good judgment/Decision maker       |
| ___ | 18.Seeks new ways of doing things            | ___ | 55.Self Motivated                     |
| ___ | 19.Practical                                 | ___ | 56.Wise/Prudent                       |
| ___ | 20.Accepts responsibility                    | ___ | 57.Focused                            |
| ___ | 21.Mentally tough                            | ___ | 58.Forgiving                          |
| ___ | 22.Humble                                    | ___ | 59.Accepts criticism                  |
| ___ | 23.Respectful                                | ___ | 60.Puts others first                  |
| ___ | 24.Honest/Truthful                           |     |                                       |
| ___ | 25.Obedient                                  |     |                                       |
| ___ | 26.Motivator                                 |     |                                       |
| ___ | 27.Team builder                              |     |                                       |
| ___ | 28.Sense of humor                            |     |                                       |
| ___ | 29.Adaptable/Anticipates trends              |     |                                       |
| ___ | 30.Genuine                                   |     |                                       |
| ___ | 31.Loyal                                     |     |                                       |
| ___ | 32.Diligent                                  |     |                                       |
| ___ | 33.Able to relax                             |     |                                       |
| ___ | 34.Tactful                                   |     |                                       |
| ___ | 35.Thoughtful                                |     |                                       |
| ___ | 36.Competent                                 |     |                                       |
| ___ | 37.Predictable                               |     |                                       |

## APPENDIX G

### Round Three Questionnaire And Instructions

May 29, 2002

Dear Participant,

Well the time has arrived that we have reached the third and final round. I want to thank each of you for your willingness to participate in this study and for the time that you have sacrificed out of your busy schedules. I will send each of you the results of this study when I have it completed.

This third round is just like the second round. It is simply an effort to reach consensus as to the value of the characteristics. The only difference is that the characteristics have now been prioritized according to the results of round two and their average score is listed beside them. You will be given an opportunity to make changes to the list by assigning values to the characteristics that you feel are most important. The process will be the same. If you think that no changes need to be made simply write in "No Changes".

In this round, you will be asked to assign a point value to each characteristic and be given a total number of which your points should not exceed. If, in your opinion, the characteristics are all equally important, give them each equal value. If, however, you think that only a few characteristics are important, use the points to assign value to the traits that you believe to be most important. Remember that the point total must not exceed the allotment for that question.

Example: This question is worth 5 points  
(These are four different scenarios)

A. <u>  </u> 1 <u>  </u> a	B. <u>  </u> 1 <u>  </u> a	C. <u>  </u> 0 <u>  </u> a	D. <u>  </u> 0 <u>  </u> a
<u>  </u> 1 <u>  </u> b	<u>  </u> 0 <u>  </u> b	<u>  </u> 0 <u>  </u> b	<u>  </u> 0 <u>  </u> b
<u>  </u> 1 <u>  </u> c	<u>  </u> 2 <u>  </u> c	<u>  </u> 0 <u>  </u> c	<u>  </u> 5 <u>  </u> c
<u>  </u> 1 <u>  </u> d	<u>  </u> 2 <u>  </u> d	<u>  </u> 4 <u>  </u> d	<u>  </u> 0 <u>  </u> d
<u>  </u> 1 <u>  </u> e	<u>  </u> 0 <u>  </u> e	<u>  </u> 1 <u>  </u> e	<u>  </u> 0 <u>  </u> e

Notice that in each scenario the total points equal five, but the responses may receive different values. The following will be two questions. Fifty points will be allotted for question one and sixty points will be allotted for question two.

To send this back through e-mail simply hit reply and then add your values in the appropriate spaces

If, for any reason, you are not sure what to do please e-mail me or call/fax me. **Round Three should be returned by June 10th. Please help me by being prompt. I must have this project submitted by the 17<sup>th</sup>.**

Jeff Moorhouse

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Prioritized List of Ethical Characteristics 50 points

<u>Previous Avg.</u>		<u>Now</u>
<u>4.02</u>	Integrity	_____
<u>3.00</u>	Honest	_____
<u>2.54</u>	Follows biblical principles of behavior	_____
<u>2.21</u>	High moral standards/Firm convictions	_____
<u>1.94</u>	Fair/Unbiased	_____
<u>1.78</u>	Dependable	_____
<u>1.67</u>	Knows right from wrong	_____
<u>1.48</u>	Strong character	_____
<u>1.45</u>	Consistent	_____
<u>1.35</u>	Free from prejudice	_____
<u>1.32</u>	Compassionate/Caring	_____
<u>1.29</u>	Obeys the rules	_____
<u>1.27</u>	Maintain confidentiality	_____
<u>1.18</u>	Strives to serve	_____
<u>1.16</u>	Selfless/puts others first	_____
<u>1.05</u>	Loyal	_____
<u>1.05</u>	Delegates authority/Lets others lead	_____
<u>1.02</u>	Resourceful	_____
<u>1.02</u>	Disciplined	_____
<u>0.97</u>	Wise/Common sense	_____
<u>0.91</u>	Good listener	_____
<u>0.86</u>	Attune to the changing needs of others	_____
<u>0.78</u>	Publicly recognizes the works of others	_____
<u>0.78</u>	Courage in decision-making	_____
<u>0.72</u>	Courageous	_____
<u>0.70</u>	Tactful	_____
<u>0.70</u>	Mature	_____
<u>0.67</u>	Courteous	_____
<u>0.64</u>	Empathetic/Sympathetic	_____
<u>0.64</u>	Patient	_____
<u>0.64</u>	Continually learning	_____
<u>0.62</u>	Straightforward	_____
<u>0.62</u>	Lacks duplicity	_____
<u>0.59</u>	Priorities greater than work	_____
<u>0.56</u>	Energetic	_____
<u>0.56</u>	Goes the extra mile	_____
<u>0.54</u>	Diligent	_____
<u>0.54</u>	Authentic	_____
<u>0.51</u>	Logical	_____
<u>0.51</u>	Goal oriented	_____
<u>0.51</u>	Diplomatic	_____

<u>0.45</u>	Creates a safe working environment	_____
<u>0.43</u>	Introspective/Reflective thinker	_____
<u>0.46</u>	Passionate	_____
<u>0.40</u>	Risk taker	_____
<u>0.40</u>	Persistent	_____
<u>0.40</u>	Defends those less fortunate	_____
<u>0.37</u>	Does things in a timely manner	_____
<u>0.32</u>	Makes decisions and sticks by them	_____
<u>0.29</u>	Volunteers in community	_____

Name: \_\_\_\_\_

Prioritized list of successful leadership traits                      60 points

<u>Previous</u>		<u>Now</u>
<u>3.56</u>	Leads by example	_____
<u>2.64</u>	Develops an atmosphere of trust	_____
<u>2.43</u>	Involves others in decisions	_____
<u>2.02</u>	Honest/Truthful	_____
<u>1.89</u>	Team builder	_____
<u>1.72</u>	Good communicator/ Articulate	_____
<u>1.70</u>	Organized	_____
<u>1.51</u>	Creates a vision for others to follow	_____
<u>1.35</u>	Accepts responsibility	_____
<u>1.35</u>	Weights options before making a decision	_____
<u>1.35</u>	Publicly recognizes the work of others	_____
<u>1.32</u>	Hires the best people possible	_____
<u>1.29</u>	Sense of humor	_____
<u>1.29</u>	Good judgment/Decision maker	_____
<u>1.29</u>	Self motivated	_____
<u>1.24</u>	Seeks first to understand/Asks questions	_____
<u>1.18</u>	Humble	_____
<u>1.18</u>	Delegates authority	_____
<u>1.16</u>	Practices the golden rule	_____
<u>1.10</u>	Optimistic	_____
<u>1.08</u>	Motivator	_____
<u>1.08</u>	Fosters growth in others/Mentors	_____
<u>1.02</u>	Genuine	_____
<u>1.00</u>	Competent	_____
<u>1.00</u>	Strong work ethic	_____
<u>0.94</u>	Loyal	_____
<u>0.91</u>	Prioritizes goals based on needs	_____
<u>0.91</u>	Respectful	_____
<u>0.89</u>	Knowledge of organization	_____
<u>0.89</u>	Forgiving	_____
<u>0.83</u>	Keeps current with research	_____

<u>0.83</u>	Seeks new ways of doing things	_____
<u>0.83</u>	Accepts criticism	_____
<u>0.81</u>	Courageous	_____
<u>0.78</u>	Accessible	_____
<u>0.78</u>	Puts others first	_____
<u>0.75</u>	Focused	_____
<u>0.75</u>	Calm under stress	_____
<u>0.75</u>	Tactful	_____
<u>0.72</u>	Adaptable/Anticipates trends	_____
<u>0.72</u>	Cooperative	_____
<u>0.72</u>	Perseveres	_____
<u>0.67</u>	Mentally tough	_____
<u>0.67</u>	Empathetic/Sympathetic	_____
<u>0.67</u>	Punctual	_____
<u>0.67</u>	Patient	_____
<u>0.64</u>	Thorough	_____
<u>0.62</u>	Financially savvy	_____
<u>0.56</u>	Expertise in the field	_____
<u>0.54</u>	Wise/Prudent	_____
<u>0.51</u>	Thoughtful	_____
<u>0.48</u>	Diligent	_____
<u>0.43</u>	Practical	_____
<u>0.37</u>	Well rounded	_____
<u>0.37</u>	Task oriented	_____
<u>0.35</u>	Competitive spirit	_____
<u>0.35</u>	Able to relax	_____
<u>0.32</u>	Obedient	_____
<u>0.27</u>	Reputation of past leadership	_____
<u>0.24</u>	Predictable	_____

## VITA

### JEFFREY RICHARD MOORHOUSE

- Personal Data:                   Date of Birth: January 11, 1969  
  Place of Birth: Rochester, Minnesota  
  Marital Status: Married
- Education:                        Johnson County High School, Mountain City, TN, 1987  
  Milligan College, Milligan College, TN;  
  Physical Education, Major / Biology, Minor, B. S., 1991  
  East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, TN;  
  Teaching, Elementary Education Concentration, M. A., 1992  
  East Tennessee State University, Johnson City, TN;  
  Educational Leadership, Ed. D, 2002
- Professional  
Experience:                        First/Sixth grade teacher, Neva and Mountain City Elementary  
  Mountain City, TN 1991-92  
  System-wide P.E. teacher, Unicoi County Schools  
  Erwin, TN 1992-92  
  Biology Teacher, Unicoi County High School  
  Erwin, TN 1993-97  
  Assistant Principal, Unicoi County Middle School  
  Erwin, TN 1997-01  
  Director of Education, John de la Howe School  
  McCormick, SC 2001-02  
  Principal, Manley Elementary School  
  Morristown, TN 2002-
- Honors:                             U.C.S&D. Conservation Teacher of the Year  
  Phi Delta Kappa, East Tennessee State University Chapter