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Abstract

The Ethical Leadership Style Questionnaire (ELSQ) was developed to assess ways a leader approaches ethical dilemmas. Based on an individual’s responses to a series of organizational vignettes, the ELSQ identifies a leader’s primary and secondary ethical leadership style. The present study is designed to refine the ELSQ to improve its ability to distinguish a leader’s predisposition to use one or more of six predominant ethical styles (virtue, justice, duty, utilitarianism, caring, and egoism). Using a sample of 106 leaders and a new version of the ELSQ that incorporates 45 short vignettes and a forced-choice design, the present study found that the ELSQ can be used satisfactorily to identify leaders’ primary and secondary ethical leadership styles. A thorough analysis of the results is provided, and implications for future research and practice are discussed.
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Chapter 1: Introduction

The purpose of this dissertation is to continue the development of the Ethical Leadership Style Questionnaire (ELSQ), which was originally constructed by Northouse (2000, 2001). The first version of the questionnaire (2001) consisted of five paragraph-long vignettes that posed a range of ethical dilemmas and asked respondents to indicate how they would resolve the dilemmas by choosing prompts that reflected six ethical styles: virtue, distributive justice, duty, utilitarianism, caring and egoism (see Appendix A). The survey was administered to a sample of 33 managers. Measurement of subjects’ responses utilized both a Likert scale and a scale based on percentages. In 2014, Chikeleze evaluated the ELSQ using the database Northouse had collected (Chikeleze, 2014).

Chikeleze’s (2014) evaluation efforts showed that a leader’s ethical leadership style could be identified using a Likert scale and a percentage-based scoring method. The research revealed three preferred ethical leadership styles: 43% of the managers identified duty as their primary ethical style, 27% identified distributive justice, 21% identified virtue, and 9% were unmatched. Caring, egoism, and utilitarianism did not occur as primary ethical styles in any significant way. Since caring, egoism, and utilitarianism are prevalent in the ethics and leadership literature, the fact that they were not strongly represented in the ELSQ data indicated a potential gap. The ELSQ data raised questions regarding whether the wording of the vignettes and the prompts
were steering respondents toward duty, distributive justice, and virtue, and away from caring, egoism, and utilitarianism. In addition, the small sample size and the use of only five vignettes may have skewed the results. Moreover, the use of relatively long vignettes combined with a scoring system that required both a Likert scale and an percentage-based response may have been cumbersome for respondents. With these considerations in mind, the present study is designed to create and evaluate a new version of the ELSQ by (1) rewording or replacing some of the vignettes and prompts, (2) increasing the number of vignettes, (3) using a two-option, forced-choice format with shorter vignettes rather than a Likert scale or percentage-based scoring system with longer vignettes, and (4) testing the new instrument on a larger sample size. It is anticipated that the new version of the ELSQ will satisfactorily identify leaders’ primary and secondary ethical leadership styles.

In the remainder of this chapter, I provide a more thorough description of the ELSQ and the validation study by Chikeleze (2014). In addition, I provide an overview of the contents of the remaining chapters of the dissertation: the literature review, methods, results, discussion, and implications for future research and practice.

**Description of the ELSQ**

Several different questionnaires have been developed to measure ethical leadership (Brown, Trevino, & Harrison, 2005; Craig & Gustafson, 1998; Kalshoven, Den Hartog, & De Hoogh, 2011; Kass & Arceri, 1994; Reidenbach & Robin, 1990; Rest, Narvaez, Thoma, & Bebeau, 1999; Riggio, Zhu, & Reina 2010; Yukl, Mahsud,
Most of these measure the perspective of followers by asking followers to assess their leaders. The ELSQ is a self-assessment instrument that measures a leader’s perspective on how he or she deals with ethical dilemmas.

The six ethical leadership styles included in the ELSQ were selected by Northouse (2001) from the literature on moral and ethical theory and fall into four broad categories: teleological approaches (morality of consequences), deontological approaches (morality of action), character approaches (morality of virtue), and caring approaches (morality of relationship). See Table 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Teleological (Morality of Consequences)</th>
<th>Deontological (Morality of Action)</th>
<th>Character (Morality of Virtue)</th>
<th>Caring (Morality of Relationship)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Egoism, Utilitarianism, Distributive justice</td>
<td>Duty</td>
<td>Virtue</td>
<td>Caring</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Northouse, 2012*

The original ELSQ consisted of five ethical vignettes that a leader might face in practice and asked participants to indicate how they would respond to these vignettes by choosing from among the six ethical leadership styles. Participants were asked to respond to two forms of the survey—one that used a percentage-based scale (Form A) and one that used a Likert scale (Form B). For example, below is one of the five vignettes:
Your work group has been awarded a large performance bonus by upper management. Members of the group know about the award and its amount. There has been discussion about how you will divide up the money. Some are arguing that every member of the team should get a one-time three-percent of annual pay bonus. Others are arguing that the highest performing persons in the group should be given an additional bonus. You are sensitive to these arguments. (Chikeleze, 2014, p. 89).

With respect to the available selections participants are able to choose from,

“determining how this situation could affect my close work relationships” reflects the caring ethical leadership style, “treating everyone fairly” reflects distributive justice, “fulfilling my obligations as the leader-in-charge” reflects duty, “making sure my own goals as leader are satisfied” reflects egoism, “doing what an exemplary leader would do in the situation” reflects virtue, and “making sure that more people benefited by the outcome than were hurt by it” reflects utilitarianism. (Chikeleze, 2014, p. 89).

On the Likert scale, participants are asked to respond in the following way:

Key: 1=Strongly Disagree 2=Disagree 3=Neutral 4=Agree 5=Strongly Agree

In this situation, I would be concerned about…

1. …determining how this situation could affect my close work relationships. 1 2 3 4 5
2. …treating everyone fairly. 1 2 3 4 5
3. …fulfilling my obligations as the leader-in-charge. 1 2 3 4 5
4. …making sure my own goals as leader are satisfied. 1 2 3 4 5
5. …doing what an exemplary leader would do in the situation. 1 2 3 4 5
6. …making sure that more people benefited by the outcome than were hurt by it. 1 2 3 4 5

Source: (Chikeleze, 2014, p. 91).

On the percentage-based scale, participants are asked to respond as follows:
In this situation, I would be concerned about….
1. …determining how this situation could affect my close work relationships. _____
2. …treating everyone fairly. _____
3. …fulfilling my obligations as the leader-in-charge. _____
4. …making sure my own goals as leader are satisfied. _____
5. …doing what an exemplary leader would do in the situation. _____
6. …making sure that more people benefited by the outcome than were hurt by it. _____

Total must equal 100%.


The purpose of using both a Likert and a percentage-based scale was to determine which approach would lead to a more robust instrument. The dual scaling had the potential side benefit of enhancing the instrument’s validity if scores on both versions told the same story.

**Chikeleze Study**
Chikeleze (2014) found that the two scales perfectly matched in 91% of cases, which can be interpreted as a high level of consistency (p. 76). In these matches, sometimes the predominant style reported by one form of the questionnaire was found to be tied with another style in the other form of the questionnaire. For example, the percentage-based scale may have found virtue to be the predominant style; but the Likert scale found virtue and justice to be tied as the most predominant styles. This “imperfect matching” was also considered to be “strong evidence of a predominant style” (Chikeleze, 2014, p. 66). Of the 91% of matches, 48% were perfect matches and 42% were imperfect matches (Chikeleze, 2014, p. 67). Chikeleze (2014) found a “strong” to “very strong” positive Pearson’s correlation between the Likert and the
percentage-based scales in 85% of cases (p. 64), which provides strong indication of
the existence of a predominant style. The percentage-based scales were found to have
far fewer ties in predominant style than the Likert scales (Chikeleze, 2014, p. 67).

Chikeleze (2014) assessed predominant styles across the demographic variables of
age, years of management experience, and employee reports (p. 79). Chikeleze (2014)
found no significant differences in these variables, nor did he find variables in
education (p. 72), but he did note a difference in gender, concluding:

The results indicate that women were more represented by a duty
ethical leadership style than were men. The data show that 60 percent
of the women had a duty ethical leadership style, while only 35
percent of the men had that style. Similarly, 35 percent of the men had
a distributive justice ethical leadership style, while only 10 percent of
the women had that style. Both men and women were about the same
in the virtue ethical leadership style (about 20 percent) and in the no
matches (about 10 percent). This analysis is important to the research
question because it could signal that gender influences ethical
leadership style (e.g., women are more inclined to the duty style and
men to the distributive justice style). However, the results of this
research are preliminary, so further research is required to draw such
conclusions (p. 71).

Based on these results, Chikeleze (2014) concluded that “the ELSQ was able to
determine predominant ethical leadership style in most of the survey participants” and
that “the ELSQ can be used to predict ethical leadership style” (p. 72).

Building on Chikeleze’s (2014) work, the purpose of this dissertation study is to
refine the ELSQ by rewording or replacing some of the vignettes and prompts. The
Purpose includes validating a new version of the instrument with a larger sample size, a larger number of vignettes, and a forced-choice response format.

This investigation is fundamentally important toward understanding the role of these forms of moral reasoning in Western society as well as in organizations. If such moral reasoning can be identified and measured, then the ELSQ could be a useful tool for a broad range of applications and organizations.

**Overview of the Dissertation**

In Chapter 2, I review the literature to clarify the rationale for my revisions to the ELSQ. This review describes the philosophical underpinnings of the six styles in order to establish a solid foundation for the construction of revised vignettes and prompts for the ELSQ. First, the associated general philosophical underpinnings of each style are discussed. Then, the application of that philosophy as an ethical leadership style prompt is reviewed.

In Chapter 3, I describe my research methods in the redesign and implementation of this quantitative online survey (Note: From now on, I refer to the revised ELSQ as the ELSQ Rev). The different versions in the evolution of the ELSQ Rev are described, and samples of the successive versions of the survey are included as Appendices B, C, D, and E. The sampling strategy and method of online application are described.
In Chapter 4, I present my results, describing the predominant styles identified, the demographic data collected, and the structure of a 15-question short version of the ELSQ Rev, referred to as the ELSQ Rev (15-question). Comparisons to Chikeleze’s (2014) results are included throughout this section. Correlations are assessed with respect to the proposed relationships. Additional tests relating to conceptual validity are reviewed.

In Chapter 5, I discuss the results and their implications for the further development of the ELSQ. Statistical, construct, and reliability analysis are performed on the ELSQ Rev and the ELSQ Rev (15-question). Metrics are provided so that managers can identify the quartile their preferences fall in with respect to each of the six styles. Implications for moral reasoning are discussed.

Finally, in Chapter 6, I discuss the implications for future research and practice. Qualitative research might investigate the nature of individuals with different predominant styles and evaluate the gender differences identified. With a much larger population, sufficient data might be available to identify gender and educational impacts where existing results show that a significant trend may exist. Different industries may display different characteristics as well. In particular, cross-cultural demographics may allow some assessment of whether certain patterns of style preferences are cultural or appear to be natural. New prompts for virtue and for egoism that do not potentially suffer from social desirability bias or conceptual
overlap could be developed. The vignettes might be further refined. The ELSQ Rev and the ELSQ Rev (15-question) might be extended or adapted to address leader assessment and other types of vignettes.
Chapter 2: Literature Review

This chapter will review each of the six ethical leadership styles (virtue, distributive justice, duty, utilitarianism, caring, and egoism). For each of the styles, first, the philosophical basis for the style will be reviewed, and then, particular consideration will be given to applying that philosophical basis as an ethical leadership style.

Virtue

In *The Oxford Companion to Philosophy*, Honderich (2005) introduces the philosophy of virtue:

> Almost all systematic approaches to ethics have something to say about what traits count as virtues and about the character of virtue as a whole. A distinction is typically made between intellectual and moral/ethical virtues… For the latter, virtues and virtue are effectively the internal analogue of (a set of) moral principles (pp. 900-901).

While virtue is widely discussed, Swanton (2013) points out the difficulty of pinning down its denotation in *The Cambridge Companion to Virtue Ethics*:

> It turns out that the task of offering a definition is difficult, complex, and highly controversial. Undertaking this task reaches to the very heart of an extremely rich and varied family of moral or ethical theories (Swanton, 2013, p. 315)

The roots of these families of theories are generally found in the classics. The classical discussion of virtue is fundamental in the work of Plato (1930/1990a, 1892/1990b, 1925/1990c), Aristotle (350 B.C./1966, 1930/1990a, 1892/1990b), and
Aquinas (1485/2006), for whom a conception of virtue that is focused on happiness is central. However, many philosophers for whom virtue is not the central focus do discuss virtue, such as Marcus Aurelius (167/1990 [Meditations, Book VIII, p. 32]), Augustine of Hipo (426/1997 [The City of God, Book XIX, Ch. 19]), Rousseau (1986 [A Discourse on Political Economy, pp. 360–373]), Kant (2012 [On the Metaphysics of Morals and Ethics, Second Section]), Mill (1861/1998 [Utilitarianism, Chapter 2]), and Hegel (2001 [Philosophy of Right, pp. 134–135]).

In the dialogue commonly titled “Cratylus,” Plato (1892/1930/1990a) defines ἀρέτη as “the stream of the good soul [that] is unimpeded” (p. 101). In Physics, Aristotle (1930/1990a) refers to virtues as the perfections of a thing according to its nature (5.3, 246a). Marcus Aurelius’s (167/1990) description of virtues is similar to Aristotle’s (1930/1990a). Building on Aristotle, Aquinas (1485/2006) notes that it is in relation to the good that man’s virtue perfects him (Q. 63, Art. 2). For Kant (1998), in Critique of Pure Reason, although virtue is unattainable, it serves as the archetype and standard for action for the wise man (Chapter III, Section I).

Rather than looking to human nature, other philosophers have focused on the perspective of society. In An Essay Concerning Human Understanding (Bk. II, ch. xxvii, §10), Locke (1975) associates virtue and vice with praise and blame. In this vein, Locke (1975) references Cicero and Virgil (Bk. II, ch. xxvii, §11). In On Liberty, Mill (1859/2011) argues that it is society’s right to make such unfavorable
judgment. In *Philosophy of Right*, Hegel (2001) adapts this notion to consider virtue as the ethical order expressed in individual character (p. 149).

Classically, according to Cunningham (1982, p. 133), these virtues are usually delineated as such:

- Temperance (σωφροσύνη or *sōphrosynē*),
- Prudence (φρόνησις or *phronēsis*),
- Fortitude (ἀνδρεία or *andreia*) and
- Justice (δικαιοσύνη or *dikaiosynē*).

Also, it should be noted that Augustine of Hippo (388/2015 [*Of the Morals of the Catholic Church: De Moribus Ecclesiae Catholicae]*) and Aquinas (1485/2006, Q. 23, Art. 3) view charity as a virtue. In these delineations of the virtues, there is overlap between the virtue of charity and the ethical style of caring, between the virtue of justice and the ethical style of distributive justice, and between the virtue of prudence and the ethical style of utilitarianism. In this way, the concept of virtue is not distinct, but rather overlaps with the definitions of the styles of caring, distributive justice, and utilitarianism.

Using the background of positive philosophy, Peterson and Seligman (2004) lay out the following character strengths and virtues:

- **Wisdom and knowledge** (strengths that involve the acquisition and use of knowledge)
• Creativity (personified in the example of Albert Einstein)
• Curiosity (personified in the example of John C. Lilly)
• Open-mindedness (personified in the example of William James)
• Love of learning (personified in the example of Benjamin Franklin)
• Perspective and wisdom (personified in the example of Ann Landers)

• **Courage** (strengths that allow one to accomplish goals in the face of opposition)
  • Bravery (personified in the example of Ernest Shackleton)
  • Persistence (personified in the example of John D. Rockefeller)
  • Integrity (personified in the example of Sojourner Truth)
  • Vitality (personified in the example of the Dalai Lama)
  • Humanity (strengths of tending and befriending others)
  • Love (personified in the example of Romeo and Juliet)
  • Kindness (personified in the example of Cicely Saunders)
  • Social intelligence (personified in the example of Oprah Winfrey)
  • Justice (strengths that build healthy community)
  • Active citizenship / social responsibility / loyalty / teamwork (personified in the example of Sam Nzima)
  • Fairness (personified in the example of Mohandas Gandhi)
  • Leadership

• **Temperance** (strengths that protect against excess)
  • Forgiveness and mercy (personified in the example of Saint John Paul II)
- Humility and modesty (personified in the example of Bill W., co-founder of Alcoholics Anonymous)
- Prudence (personified in the example of Fred Soper)
- Self-regulation and self control (personified in the example of Jerry Rice)
- **Transcendence** (strengths that forge connections to the larger universe and provide meaning)
  - Appreciation of beauty and appreciation of excellence (personified in the example of Walt Whitman)
  - Gratitude (personified in the example of G. K. Chesterton)
  - Hope (personified in the example of Martin Luther King, Jr.)
  - Humor and playfulness (personified in the example of Mark Twain)
  - Spirituality, or a sense of purpose and coherence (personified in the example of Albert Schweitzer)

These virtues encompass many of the concepts covered in the virtues described by Aristotle (1930/1990a) and Aquinas (1485/2006).

In the area of leadership virtues, these virtues in particular have been seen as being varied (Velasquez, 1992) and in the heart of the individual (Pojman, 1995). Leaders who do not reflect virtues, but rather the characteristics contrary to virtues, may be identified as toxic leaders (Lipmen-Blumen, 2005).
Virtue as an ethical leadership style

By seeking moral excellence, or “conformity to a standard of right” ("virtue," n.d.), virtue ethics is a normative ethical theory. While grounded in the work of Plato (1892/1930/1990a, 1892/1990b, 1925/1990c) and Aristotle (350 B.C./1966, 1930/1990a, 1892/1990b), virtue ethics finds support from philosophers as varied as Mill, Hegel, and Kant. While dimensions such as temperance, prudence, fortitude, justice, and wisdom are traditionally associated with virtue ethics, modern formulations, such as those by Peterson and Seligman (2004), see detailed principles undergirding those dimensions and distinguish transcendence as an additional dimension. Even in these modern formulations, the essential goal remains to prescribe a set of integral principles for excellence of character. For this reason, the core imperatives for this ethical style are as follows:

- Acts with integrity; and is faithful to his/her principles.
- Exhibits excellence of character.
- Does what a good person would do.

The final prompt in the ELSQ Rev for the ethical leadership style of virtue is “I would do what a good person would do.” A leader who has virtue as a primary style would be an individual who makes a decision based on who he or she is as a good person. Such a leader’s primary concern in assessing actions to take would be that the action represents who the leader is and what the leader stands for. In assessing a response to a vignette, if an option to do what a good person would do is offered, then
a leader with a primary ethical leadership style of virtue would be expected to select that option as his or her primary response. In the ELSQ Rev, additional verbiage is included in the instructions section, defining this style in more detail. It reads as follows:

*I would do what a good person would do:* This option includes exhibiting excellence of character, acting with integrity, and being faithful to one’s principles. This option includes employing virtues such as courage, honesty, and loyalty.

This additional verbiage allows a manager completing the ELSQ Rev to better understand the conceptual background of the prompt.

**Distributive Justice**

In introducing the concept of distributive justice, Honderich (2005) explains,

Justice in one sense is identical with the ethics of who should receive benefits and burdens, good or bad things of many sorts, given that others might receive these things. . . . There are various contexts for talk about justice, including (at least) distributive, retributive, and ‘corrective’ justice (which apparently overlap to some extent). Distributive justice concerns the ethical appropriateness of which recipients get which benefits and burdens. (p. 443)

Distributive justice—like the normative philosophies of utilitarianism and egoism—is consequentialist in that it focuses on the consequences of the action taken rather than the moral character of the agent. Teleological considerations refer to the purpose intended. These philosophies are normative in that they refer to what managers
“ought” to do. In this way, they support the suggestion that “the ends justify the means” (Mizzoni, 2009, p. 104).

As early as Plato’s (1925/1990) dialogues between Socrates and Thrasymachus in *The Republic* (p. 297) and *Gorgias* (p. 259), the notion of justice (*dikaiosune*) has been a key issue in philosophy. In “Politics,” Aristotle (1892/1990b) points out that “justice is the bond of men in states; for the administration of justice, which is the determination of what is just, is the principle of order in political society” (I.2, 1252a36-1252a39).

On the importance of justice, Rawls (1971) observes,

> Justice is the first virtue of social institutions, as truth is on systems of truth. A theory however elegant and economical must be rejected or revise if it is untrue; likewise laws and institutions no matter how efficient and well arranges must be reformed or abolished if they are unjust. Each person possesses an inviolability founded on justice that even the welfare of society as a whole cannot override. For this reason justice denies that the loss of freedom for some is made right by a greater good shared by others. (p. 3)

For Rawls (1971), “the main problem of distributive justice is the choice of a social system” (p. 242). In this context, leadership in business can be considered a social system.

In a more modern treatment, Forsyth (2006) identifies five specific distributive norms:
• Equity: The norm of equity suggests that the outcomes members receive should be related to their inputs. In consequence, the idea that a member who has invested a great deal of resources (e.g. money, time, energy) should receive more as an outcome than a group member who, in comparison, contributed much less (Forsyth, 2006, p. 388) suggests that members of large groups generally prefer rewards and costs to be based on equity.

• Equality: For this norm, irrespective of their inputs, all members of the group should receive an equal share of the outputs. For instance, equality suggests that someone who might only provide a small amount of the group’s resources should receive as much output as someone who contributes a great deal.

• Power: The power norm suggests that those who have more status, authority, or control in the group should receive more of the outputs than group members who have lower status, authority, or control.

• Need: The norm of need suggests that the group members with the greatest needs should be provided with a greater share of the resources needed to meet those needs. This greater share is provided regardless of the input of the needy member.

• Responsibility: For the norm of responsibility, the group members who have the most resources should share their resources with those members who have less.

Contemporary research has found that when groups are perceived as distributively just, organizational citizenship behaviors (OCBs) are more prevalent (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001; Karriker & Williams, 2009). It has also been found that when
organizational decisions and action are perceived as more just, then organizational
citizenship behavior by employees is more likely to occur. The departure of
employees from organizations is strongly associated with perceptions of the lack of

Performance of organizations is also related to justice. Performance is improved as
perceptions of justice are improved (Karriker & Williams, 2009). Performance is also
affected by distributive justice when efficiency and productivity are involved (Cohen-

For perspective in the literature, it is important to note that Kohlberg (1983) argues
that “virtue is all one” (uniform and singular) and “the name of this ideal form is
justice” (p. 30–31). This claim would not necessarily imply that the only ethical style
is justice. This position is of value to reference, as Gilligan (1977) gives the ethic of
caring its early formulation largely in contrast to Kohlberg’s (1983) perspective.
Kohlberg’s position has received some criticism (Crain, 1985).

Specifically, in the area of distributive justice, Beauchamp and Bowie (2004) explain,

The term distributive justice refers to the proper distribution of social
benefits and burdens. A theory of distributive justice attempts to
establish a connection between the properties or characteristics of
persons and the morally correct distribution of benefits and burdens in
society (p. 631).
After identifying different theories of distributive justice (egalitarian, communitarian, libertarian, and utilitarian), Beaucamp and Bowie (2004) identify the “major candidates” for the principles of distributive justice:

- To each person an equal share.
- To each person according to individual need.
- To each person according to that person’s rights.
- To each person according to individual effort.
- To each person according to societal contribution.
- To each person according to merit (p. 631).

**Distributive Justice as an ethical leadership style**

Drawing on roots that stretch into ancient Greek philosophy, modern distributive justice ethics (Forsyth, 2006) identifies dimensions of equity, equality, power, need, and responsibility that are associated with organizational citizenship behaviors (Cohen-Charash & Spector, 2001, and Karriker & Williams, 2009) and improved performance (Karriker & Williams, 2009). Across these formulations, the essential goal of distributive justice remains the requirement of fair and equitable treatment. For this reason, the core imperatives for this ethical style are as follows:

- Is equitable to others, treating everyone equally.
- Acts with justice.
- Does what is fair.

The final prompt in the ELSQ Rev for the ethical leadership style of distributive justice is “I would do what is fair.” A leader who has distributive justice as a primary
style would be an individual who makes a decision based on his or her perception of what is fair. Such a leader’s primary concern in assessing actions to take would be that the action represents a fair response. In assessing a response to a vignette, if an option to do what is fair is offered, then a leader with a primary ethical leadership style of distributive justice would be expected to select that option as his or her primary response. In the ELSQ Rev, the additional verbiage defining distributive justice reads as follows:

*I would do what is fair:* This option includes acting with justice, being equitable to others, and treating others fairly. It also includes distributing benefits and burdens while treating everyone equally.

This additional verbiage allows a manager completing the ELSQ Rev to better understand the conceptual background of the prompt.

**Duty**

In introducing the philosophy of duty, *The Oxford Companion to Philosophy* explains the following:

Along with the concepts of ‘ought’ and ‘obligation’, the concept of duty expresses moral action as *demanded or required*. ‘The moral law’, wrote Kant, is for us ‘a law of duty, of moral constraint.’ How is this cluster of concepts related to the contrasting cluster centering upon ‘good’ and the realization of value? For some moralists (including Kant again), ‘Duty and obligation are the only name’ for ‘our relation to the moral law’ (*Critique of Practical Reason*). For others, our duties, though not reducible to different terms, make sense only as regulating human life so as best to achieve good ends and to respect rational and sentient beings. (Honderich 2005, p. 209)
Duty (or deon) is the basis of deontological normative ethics. As far back as Plato, the duty not to harm others (Gorgias 481) and the duty to turn yourself into the appropriate judge (Gorgias 479) are identified. Aurelius (167/1990) boasts that “I do my duty: other things trouble me not; for they are either things without life, or things without reason, or things that have rambles and know not the way” (6.22, p. 261). And in Chapter 8, section 32, Aurelius (167/1990) states, “It is thy duty to order thy life well in every single act; and if every act does its duty, as far as is possible, be content” (p. 272).

In Critique of Pure Reason, Kant (1998) shares a key directive: “morality is not the doctrine of how we may make ourselves happy, but how we may make ourselves worthy of happiness” (p. 87). In Fundamental Principles of the Metaphysics of Morals, Kant (2013) lays out his strategy for consideration of morals:

As my concern here is with moral philosophy, I limit the question suggested to this: Whether it is not of the utmost necessity to construct a pure moral philosophy perfectly cleared of everything which is only empirical and which belongs to anthropology? For that such a philosophy must be possible is evident from the common idea of duty and of the moral laws ... the basis of obligation must not be sought in the nature of man, or in the circumstance in which he is placed, but a priori simply in the conception of pure reason. (254)

Kant (2013) frames this search as for the categorical imperative or “that which represents an action as necessary of itself without reference to another end, i.e., as objectively necessary” (p. 265). His first formulation of this is to “act as if the maxim of thy action were to become by thy will a universal law of nature” (p. 268). Kant’s
(2013) second formulation is to “act as to treat humanity, whether in thine own person, or in that of any other, in every case as an end withal, never as means only” (p. 272). His third formulation is to “act on maxims which can at the same time have for their object themselves as universal law of nature” (p. 276).

The evaluation of maxims is addressed by Kant (1990) in *The Metaphysical Elements of Ethics* where he asks, “What are the Ends which are also Duties? They are: A. Our own perfection, B. Happiness of Others” (p. 369). These principles form the core of Kant’s deontology.

A different perspective on duty is provided by Ross. Ross (2002) defined prima facie duties as a characteristic of an act:

I suggest ‘*prima facie* duty’ or ‘conditional duty’ as a brief way of referring to the characteristic . . . which an act has, in virtue of being of a certain kind, . . . of being an act which would be a duty proper if it were not as the same time of another kind which is morally significant. (p. 19)

Rather than operating as strict duties, prima facie duties provide reasons for action:

So by replacing principles of duty proper with principles of prima facie duty we move away from principles telling us what we ought to do to principles that state which facts are the *reasons* why we ought to do certain acts, and which provide us reasons to do those acts. (Ross, 2002, p. 370).

Since they are reasons rather than proper duties, they only tend to make certain actions right and they can be defeated:
As I understand prima facie duties they are recommenders not recommendations. They do not tell you what you should do, but pick out features that give you reason to do certain acts. . . . Principles of prime facie duty pick out features of acts or situations that tend to make certain actions right. So if they are not defeated in some way they will pick out the reason why some act is right. (Ross, 2002, p. 367)

**Duty as an ethical leadership style**

Drawing from the work of Plato (1892/1930/1990a, 1892/1990b, 1925/1990c), Aristotle (350 B.C./1966, 1930/1990a, 1892/1990b), and Kant, duty ethics emphasized the responsibility to fulfill one’s moral obligations to others. In particular, Kant’s (2013) categorical imperative emphasizes the responsibility to treat others as ends and not means (p. 276). For these reasons, the core imperatives for this ethical style are:

- Meets his/her responsibilities.
- Does his/her duty.
- Fulfills his/her obligations.

The final prompt in the ELSQ Rev for the ethical leadership style of duty is “I would do my duty.” A leader who has duty as a primary style would be an individual who makes a decision based on his or her perception of their duty. Such a leader’s primary concern in assessing actions to take would be that the action best fulfills his or her duty. In assessing a response to a vignette, if an option to do the leader’s duty is offered, then a leader with a primary ethical leadership style of duty would be
expected to select that option as their primary response. In the ELSQ Rev, the additional verbiage defining duty reads as follows:

*I would do my duty*: This option includes following the rules, meeting my responsibilities, fulfilling my obligations, and adhering to company policy. Rules in this context may be explicit or implicit.

This additional verbiage allows a manager completing the ELSQ Rev to better understand the conceptual background of the prompt.

**Utilitarianism**

Classically founded by Bentham (1789/2009) and Mill (1861/1998), utilitarianism is generally perceived as maximizing total benefit (Goodstein, 2011, p. 26). *The Oxford Companion to Philosophy* explains,

> Utilitarianism is an approach to morality that treats pleasure or desire-satisfaction as the sole element in human good and that regards the morality of actions as entirely dependent on consequences of results for human (or sentient) well-being. (Honderich 2005, p. 890).

While the origin of utilitarianism is typically associated with Bentham, very similar concepts are found in the work of earlier authors. Hume (1751/2010a) writes in *An Enquiry Concerning the Principles of Morals*,

> In all determinations of morality, this circumstance of public utility is ever principally in view; and wherever disputes arise, either in philosophy or common life, concerning the bounds of duty, the question cannot, by any means, be decided with greater certainty, than by ascertaining, on any side, the true interests of mankind. If any false opinion, embraced from appearances, has been found to prevail; as soon as farther experience and sounder reasoning have given us juster
notions of human affairs, we retract our first sentiment, and adjust anew the boundaries of moral good and evil. (p. 61)

Earlier roots notwithstanding, Bentham (1789/2009) introduces the concept of utilitarianism:

Nature has placed mankind under the governance of two sovereign masters, pain and pleasure. It is for them alone to point out what we ought to do . . . By the principle of utility is meant that principle which approves or disapproves of every action whatsoever according to the tendency it appears to have to augment or diminish the happiness of the party whose interest is in question: or, what is the same thing in other words to promote or to oppose that happiness. I say of every action whatsoever, and therefore not only of every action of a private individual, but of every measure of government. (p. 1)

Mill (1861/1998) proposes a proof of the principle in *Utilitarianism*:

The only proof capable of being given that an object is visible, is that people actually see it. The only proof that a sound is audible, is that people hear it . . . In like manner, I apprehend, the sole evidence it is possible to produce that anything is desirable, is that people do actually desire it… No reason can be given why the general happiness is desirable, except that each person, so far as he believes it to be attainable, desires his own happiness . . . we have not only all the proof which the case admits of, but all which it is possible to require, that happiness is a good: that each person’s happiness is a good to that person, and the general happiness, therefore, a good to the aggregate of all persons. (p. 81)

This core belief in the ability to aggregate happiness across individuals is a distinctive feature of utilitarianism. In ethical utilitarianism, a moral agent treats the importance of their happiness as equal to that of others. Utilitarian leadership has been treated by researchers such as Schuman (2001).
**Utilitarianism as an ethical leadership style**

Rooted in the work of Bentham (1789/2009) and Mill (1861/1998), utilitarianism strives to maximize total benefit aggregated across individuals (Goodstein 2011, p. 26). In the formulation of utilitarian ethics, the essential goal of maximizing benefit is central. For this reason, the core imperatives for this ethical style are as follows:

- Does what benefits the most people.
- Helps the most people overall.
- Works to create the greatest good for the greatest number.

The final prompt in the ELSQ Rev for the ethical leadership style of utilitarianism is “I would do what benefits the most people.” A leader who has utilitarianism as a primary style would be an individual who makes a decision based on what benefits the most people. Such a leader’s primary concern in assessing actions to take would be to consider the action he or she perceives as most beneficial across all people. In assessing a response to a vignette, if an option to do what benefits the most people is offered, then a leader with a primary ethical leadership style of utilitarianism would be expected to select that option as their primary response. In the ELSQ Rev, the additional verbiage defining utilitarianism reads as follows:

* I would do what benefits the most people: This option includes doing what helps the most people overall and what creates the greatest total happiness. It also includes doing the greatest good for the greatest number.
This additional verbiage allows an individual completing the ELSQ Rev to better understand the conceptual background of the prompt.

**Caring**

In the description of the “ethics of care,” *The Oxford Companion to Philosophy* explains,

> The term ‘ethics of care’ refers to a group of moral reflections about the moral emotion and virtue of care that emerged from feminist theory. The hypothesis that ‘women speak in a different voice’—‘the voice of care’—rose to prominence in Carol Gilligan’s book *In a Different Voice* (1982). Through empirical research, she claimed to discover a female voice stressing empathic association with others and a sense of being responsible and caring. (Honderich, 2005, p. 121)

The “relational perspective” of caring about the welfare of others is common to many cultures and worldviews (Gupta, 2011). The elaboration of relational philosophies has led to a full relational ontology (Stout, 2011). Much of this foundation has been laid by the work of the New York School in the 1990s (Mische 2011, p. 80).

While the concept of an ethic of care is generally associated with work initiated by Gilligan (1977, 1982), it has connections, roots and support in the related concepts of moral sentiments, altruism, and charity. Caring, or at least concern for relationships, also finds support in leadership scholarship such as the Ohio State Studies and the Michigan State Studies. While a significant part of Gilligan’s (1977, 1982) key early work centered on compassion and relationship supported by interviews, her recent
work (2014) has had a key role for empathy, mind-reading, and cooperation with support from such sciences as neurobiology and primatology. In this way, the ethic of care finds support in a number of philosophical perspectives. This support will be reviewed in the following sections.

The roots of ethical caring in the philosophy of moral sentiments
As Tronto (2005) points out, “this ethic of care bears a family resemblance to those eighteenth-century theories of moral sentiments” (p. 256). Of the eighteenth-century theories, that of A. Smith’s is foundational. In broad structure, Smith (2010) followed the perspectives of his mentor, Hutcheson, of the University of Glasgow, dividing philosophy in four parts: Ethics and Virtue; Private rights and Natural liberty; Familial rights (known as Economics); and State and Individual rights (known as Politics). Regarding moral philosophy, Hutcheson (in Hutcheson & Leechman, 1755, p. 52) rejected a psychological perspective because he felt motives were too unstable a base for the conceptual framework. Rather, he argued for the existence of a dedicated “sixth sense” which explains morality. Hume (1739/2010b), in his work *A Treatise of Human Nature*, used this general structure to argue that people are pleased by utility.

Rejecting Hutcheson’s dedicated sixth sense, Smith (2010) preferred to use an appeal to human experience, using the experimental methods of Hume and replacing the single dedicated sense with a pluralistic approach to morality that presumed many different psychological motives. In the beginning of *The Theory of Moral Sentiments*, Smith (2010) makes the following claim:
How selfish soever man may be supposed, there are evidently some principles in his nature, which interest him in the fortunes of others, and render their happiness necessary to him, though he derives nothing from it, except the pleasure of seeing it. Of this kind is pity or compassion, the emotion we feel for the misery of others, when we either see it, or are made to conceive it in a very lively manner. That we often derive sorrow from the sorrows of others, is a matter of fact too obvious to require any instances to prove it; for this sentiment, like all the other original passions of human nature, is by no means confined to the virtuous or the humane, though they perhaps may feel it with the most exquisite sensibility. The greatest ruffian, the most hardened violator of the laws of society, is not altogether without it. (I.1.1)

Here, the principle that Smith (2010) comes to call “sympathy” replaces the “moral sense” principle of Shaftesbury (1711, p.466), Hutcheson & Leechman (1755, p.52), and Hume (1739/2010b, 1751/2010a), as the central motivating agent. “Sympathy” was used by Smith (2010) to refer to the feeling of these moral sentiments. It is the way that one individual could feel the passions of another. For Smith (2010), this connection occurred through the mechanism of “mirroring,” where a person imaginatively construed the experience of another. Smith (2010) explains,

As we have no immediate experience of what other men feel, we can form no idea of the manner in which they are affected, but by conceiving what we ourselves should feel in the like situation. Though our brother is on the rack, as long as we ourselves are at our ease, our senses will never inform us of what he suffers. They never did, and never can, carry us beyond our own person, and it is by the imagination only that we can form any conception of what are his sensations. Neither can that faculty help us to this any other way, than by representing to us what would be our own, if we were in his case. It is the impressions of our own senses only, not those of his, which our imaginations copy. By the imagination, we place ourselves in his situation. (I.1.2)
While this principle could be extended to concern for all human beings, Smith (2010) limited the operation of this principle to a narrower, more immediate set of individuals. In the operation of this principle, our understanding is hampered by limited knowledge of the means to achieve these ends and by our instincts:

The administration of the great system of the universe . . . the care of the universal happiness of all rational and sensible beings, is the business of God and not of man. To man is allotted a much humbler department, but one much more suitable to the weakness of his powers, and to the narrowness of his comprehension: the care of his own happiness, of that of his family, his friends, his country. . . . But though we are . . . endowed with a very strong desire of those ends, it has been entrusted to the slow and uncertain determinations of our reason to find out the proper means of bringing them about. Nature has directed us to the greater part of these by original and immediate instincts. Hunger, thirst, the passion which unites the two sexes, and the dread of pain, prompt us to apply those means for their own sakes, and without any consideration of their tendency to those beneficent ends which the great Director of nature intended to produce by them. (Smith, 2010, VI.II.49)

Elaboarting further, Smith (2010) concludes,

The rich only select from the heap what is most precious and agreeable. They consume little more than the poor, and in spite of their natural selfishness and rapacity, though they mean only their own conveniency, though the sole end which they propose from the labours of all the thousands whom they employ, be the gratification of their own vain and insatiable desires, they divide with the poor the produce of all their improvements. They are led by an invisible hand to make nearly the same distribution of the necessaries of life, which would have been made, had the earth been divided into equal portions among all its inhabitants, and thus without intending it, without knowing it, advance the interest of the society, and afford means to the multiplication of the species. (IV.I.10)
While the principles of economic trade and moral sentiment seem contradictory, in V. L. Smith’s (1998) interpretation of the philosopher Smith’s sentiments, they merely distinguish two different modes of exchange: goods and sentiments. These two modes represent

one behavioral axiom, ‘the propensity to truck, barter, and exchange one thing for another,’ where the objects of trade I will interpret to include not only goods, but also gifts, assistance, and favors out of sympathy . . . whether it is goods or favors that are exchanged, they bestow gains from trade that humans seek relentlessly in all social transactions. Thus, Adam Smith’s single axiom, broadly interpreted . . . is sufficient to characterize a major portion of the human social and cultural enterprise. It explains why human nature appears to be simultaneously self-regarding and other-regarding. (Smith, 1998, p. 2)

**The roots of an ethic of care in the philosophy of altruism**

In describing altruism, *The Oxford Companion to Philosophy* explains that:

> The beginning of altruism is the realization that not all good and bad are good-for-me and bad-for-me: that certain others—my close friends, say—have joys and sufferings distinct from mine, but for which I have a sympathetic concern—and for their sake, not my own. (Honderich 2005, p. 221).

Comte (1973) used the term altruism (in French, *altruisme*) as the antonym of egoism. For Comte (1973), altruism meant living for the sake of others. As a philosophical ethical doctrine, altruism holds that the moral value of an individual’s actions depend solely on the impact of others regardless of the consequences to the self. Regarding this philosophy, Comte (1973) explains that:

> [The] social point of view cannot tolerate the notion of rights, for such notion rests on individualism. We are born under a load of obligations of every kind, to our predecessors, to our successors, to our
contemporaries. After our birth these obligations increase or accumulate, for it is some time before we can return any service . . . . This [“to live for others”], the definitive formula of human morality, gives a direct sanction exclusively to our instincts of benevolence, the common source of happiness and duty. [Man must serve] Humanity, [who] we are entirely (p. 212).

If the “obligations of every kind” and the services “given and returned” that Comte (1973) discusses are presumed to create relationships, then altruism can be conceived as a philosophy of relationships. The ethics of altruistic leadership have been treated by multiple researchers (Bass & Steidlmieier, 1999; Bowie, 1991; Kanungo, 2011; Kanungo & Mendonca, 1996).

**The ethics of care as described by Gilligan**
Adding a feminist perspective, Gilligan (1977, 1982, 2013, 2014) has been a pioneer in arguing that women in particular tend to emphasize compassion and relationships more than men, who tend to emphasize impersonal consideration of justice. This discussion of the ethics of care will focus on dimensions of that ethic that apply to consideration of ethical styles, and not to the balance of Gilligan or others’ work in this area. Along with others (Benner & Wrubel, 1989; Card, 1990; Cole & Coultrap-McQuin, 1992; Chu & Gilligan, 2014; Gilligan, Langdale, Lyons, & Murphy, 1982; Murphy & Gilligan, 1980; Porter, 1991), Gilligan is one of the vocal advocates of the concept of the ethics of care. Supporting Gilligan, Tronto (2005) argues that in the ethics of care, it is important that “we recognize that humans are not only autonomous and equal, but that they are also beings who require care” (p. 252). Extending
Gilligan’s work, Collins (2005) argues systematically that dependency on another for care creates a moral responsibility (pp. 36–37 & 60–63).

While not excluding men from its use, Gilligan (1982, p. 2) formulated the notion as a result of hearing in interviews with women a voice with “the constant eye to maintaining relational order and connection” (1982, p. xiv). In this particular aspect, Gilligan (1982, p. 8) aligns herself with the work of Erikson (1950) and Chodorow (1974)—and against “the masculine bias of psychoanalytic theory,” in particular the work of Piaget (1962) and Freud (1961a, 1961b). As Gilligan (1982) points out, “Erikson’s description of male identity as forged in relation to the world and of female identity as awakened in a relationship of intimacy with another person is hardly new” (p. 13). She criticizes those who, in her view, fail to appreciate the focus on relationship but rather see it as a deficient ignorance of due justice. In particular, Gilligan (1982) shares that “the criticism that Freud makes of women’s sense of justice, seeing it as compromised in its refusal of blind impartiality, reappears not only in the work of Piaget but also in that of Kohlberg” (p. 18). In contrast to rules for individuals, Gilligan (1982) brings up the exemplar of a participant “seeing a world compromised of relationships rather than of people standing alone, a world that coheres through human connection rather than through systems of rules” (p. 29). She sees this in sharp contrast to Kohlberg’s work, in particular Kohlberg, Levine, & Hewer’s (1983) work, *Moral Stages: A Current Formulation and a Response to Critics*. She also contrasts her views specifically with Freud’s *Civilization and its*
Discontents (1961a), contrasting her perspective with Freud’s notion of love (Gilligan, 1982, p. 45–48). She reports major gender differences when she explains,

My research suggests that men and women may speak different languages that they assume are the same, using similar words to encode disparate experiences of self and social relationships. Because these languages share an overlapping moral vocabulary, they contain a propensity for systematic mistranslation, creating misunderstandings which impede communication and limit the potential for cooperation and care in relationships. (Gilligan, 1982, p. 73)

Gilligan’s work has been controversial with enthusiasts seeking to corroborate it and critics questioning her “methodology and her conclusions” (Larrabee, 1993, p. 5). Krebs, Vermeulen, Denton, and Carpendale, (1994) found that Kohlburg’s tests and scoring system are partially biased against females. Larrabee (1993) even points out that “feminist critics, in particular, have worried about the undesirable implications concerning her focus on the ‘womanly virtues’ that have traditionally been used to keep women in the ‘private’ sphere” (p. 5).

Advocates of Gilligan’s position point to research (Lyons, 1983; Gilligan & Wiggins, 1987) which suggests that in some situations, while most people use both care and justice considerations, over two-thirds have three-fourths or more considerations in one mode or the other. This occurs with men tending to the justice consideration and women towards the care consideration.
In contrast, Walker’s (1984) work, spanning 31 studies involving 2,879 participants, found significant sex differences in only six studies—with one of those studies actually not having a statistically significant result (p. 687). Ford and Lowery (1986) and Rothbart, Hanley, and Albert (1986) had similar findings. Walker’s work was criticized by Baumrind (1986), causing Walker (1986) to defend his conclusions. Later, Walker (1991) suggested that sex differences, when found, disappeared after controlling for educational level and occupation. More recently, Jaffee and Hyde (2000) found that what small gender differences exist disappear when controlling for moderating variables.

The review of literature on sex differences is beyond the scope of this analysis; however, the previous discussion will suffice to justify the inclusion of gender, educational, and occupational information as demographic information included in the updated ELSQ.

In response to such claims, one reply from Gilligan (1987) points out,

To claim that there is a voice different from those which psychologists have represented, I need only one example, one voice whose coherence is not recognized with existing interpretive schemes. To claim that common themes recur in women’s conceptions of self and morality, I need a series of illustrations. (p. 327)

Thus, in both the conceptualization of the ELSQ and in Gilligan’s identification of a different voice, the existence or magnitude of any gender difference is not material.
Of particular interest in Gilligan’s treatment of the ethic of care is the relative positioning of the two ethics of care and justice, respectively, as this can suggest the relative positioning of the ethical styles. As Flanagan and Jackson (1993) point out regarding Gilligan,

Her recent work still shifts between the ideas that the two ethics are incompatible alternatives to each other but are both adequate from a normative point of view; that they are complements of each other involved in some sort of tense interplay; and that each is deficient without the other and thus ought to be integrated. (p. 75)

In her recent work, Gilligan (2014) proposes a foundation for the ethic of care based on a new body of research:

Meanwhile, a paradigm shift has been spreading through the human sciences. A growing body of evidence coming from developmental psychology, neurobiology, primatology, and evolutionary anthropology has framed what had been taken as milestones of development in a new light. Rather than signifying healthy forms of maturation, the separation of the self from relationships and the splitting of thought from emotion signal injury or responses to trauma. (p. 89)

Gilligan (2014) now cites the work of primatologist de Waal (2002) and evolutionary anthropologist Blaffer Hrdy (2010) on areas such as empathy, mind-reading, and cooperation (p.89). In particular, de Wall (2002), in analyzing primate behavior to “extend the concept of empathy into ultimate and proximate domains, and to try to link empathy in humans and nonhumans” (p. 58), gives a biological support for the importance of
empathy. Using the social psychology literature to apply the concepts of empathy and altruism as justification for the ethic of care had been previously suggested by Brabeck (1983) as a theoretical basis, though not as a clear justification of gender differences (p. 44).

Tronto (2005) identifies in these ethics four elements: attentiveness, responsibility, competence, and responsiveness. This represents a process flow from identifying a need, to taking a duty to address it, to being capable of addressing it, to actually filling the need. Regarding attentiveness, Tronto (2005) points out that “recognizing the needs of those around us, is a difficult task, and indeed, a moral achievement” (p. 252). In discussing attentiveness, Tronto (2005) explicitly references Monroe, Barton, and Klingermann (1990), making a connection with altruism. Regarding responsibility, Tronto (2005) describes a balance between being overly responsible and shirking responsibility, and between cultural and legal perspectives (p. 254). In the area of competence, Tronto (2005) explicitly looks to “align this approach with moral consequentialism” (p. 254). However, Tronto is clear that this alignment is only for this step of the caring process, not for the overall process, which is distinctive. In a discussion of responsiveness, Tronto (2005) emphasizes the importance of taking action and that “by its nature, care is concerned with conditions of vulnerability and inequality” (p. 255). In this way, care is an integral process that “involves more than simply good intentions” (Tronto, 2005, p. 255).
Nunner-Winkler (1993) points out that “Gilligan’s description of an ethic of care and responsibility includes questions concerning the conception of the good life that do not belong to morality proper” (p. 143). According to Nunner-Winkler (1993), failing to recognize the applicability of Kant’s (1977) distinction between perfect and imperfect duties is the cause of Gilligan’s tension between an ethic of caring and an ethic of justice (p. 145). Perfect duties, like “do not steal,” can be specifically and fully complied with. Imperfect duties, like “help the needy,” cannot be specifically and fully complied with. Nunner-Winker (1984) sees justice as a perfect duty and care as an imperfect duty (p. 349), referencing an interview reported by Gilligan (1977, p. 510) with this interpretation:

This orientation to imperfect duties finds its most concise expression in one woman’s statement in an interview “Is it right to spend money on a pair of shoes, when I have a pair of shoes and other people are shoeless?” The very form this reflection takes, the interrogative, is proof of its being derived from an imperfect duty, namely, the principle of charity, which does not define its own form of application, its own limits, and the degree to which it is binding. (Nunner-Winkler, 1984, p. 349-50)

In this way, Nunner-Winkler (1984) shows that the application of Kant’s (1977) notion of perfect and imperfect duties is consistent in this case with the principle of charity. Philosophies supporting a principle of charity may provide another basis for justification of an ethic of care.
Caring and charity

Charity, as expressed across the major religions, is often referred to as the “Golden Rule” of “Do unto others as you would have them do unto you.” Support for this notion can be found in the official teachings of many religions:

- Good people proceed while considering that what is best for others is best for themselves. (*Hitopadesa*, Hinduism)
- Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself. (*Leviticus* 19:13, Judaism)
- Therefore all things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them. (*Matthew* 7:12, Christianity)
- Hurt not others with that which pains yourself. (*Udanavarga* 5:18, Buddhism)
- What you so not want done to yourself, do not do to others. (*Analects* 15:23, Confucianism)
- No one of you is a believer until he loves for his brother what he loves for himself. (*Traditions*, Islam)

These religious injunctions promote a relationship of solidarity between individuals. In this way, the caring that one has for oneself should be balanced with a caring for the other. This common bond of caring is similar to Gilligan’s (1982) ethic of care. However, the “Golden Rule” can be construed more widely than as a dimension of caring.
**Caring and relationship: the Ohio State and University of Michigan Studies**

Leadership researchers at Ohio State identified two general classes of leader behaviors: initiating structure and consideration (Stogdill, 1974). Consideration behaviors were essentially relationship behaviors, such as building camaraderie, respect, trust, and liking between followers and leaders.

Leadership researchers at the University of Michigan also identified two general classes of leader behaviors: employee orientation and production orientation (Bowers & Seashore, 1966). Employee orientation was similar to consideration, as it included human relations emphasis, interest in workers as human beings, valuing worker individuality, and giving special attention to workers’ personal needs.

From the time of the Ohio State and University of Michigan studies, the importance of relationships has been highlighted in leadership studies. In the area of ethical leadership measurement research, a continued reflection of the importance of relationships can be inferred by the inclusion of civility in the Perceived Leader Integrity Scale (PLIS) (Craig & Gustafson, 1998) and people orientation in the Ethical Leadership Work Questionnaire (ELWQ) (Kalshoven, Den Hartog & De Hoogh, 2011). While including an element of relationship in these instruments, none of them include ethical styles as defined in the ELSQ as internal orientations for action.
Caring as an ethical leadership style

Whether from the perspective of a feminist perspective (Gilligan, 1982; Nunner-Winkler, 1993; Tronto, 2005), altruism, moral sentiments, charity, or relationship, caring ethics engender passionate concern for the benefit of others. For these reasons, the core imperatives for this ethical style are as follows:

- Is sensitive to the needs of others.
- Builds and maintains caring relationships.
- Is responsive to the needs of others.

The final prompt in the ELSQ Rev for the ethical leadership style of caring is “I would be sensitive and caring in my close relationships.” A leader who has caring as a primary style would be an individual who makes a decision based on being sensitive and caring in his or her close relationships. Such a leader’s primary concern in assessing actions to take would be that the action that he or she perceives treats their close relationships in a sensitive and caring way. In assessing a response to a vignette, if an option to do what is caring and sensitive to close relationships is offered, then a leader with a primary ethical leadership style of caring would be expected to select that option as their primary response. In the ELSQ Rev, the additional verbiage defining caring reads as follows:

_I would be sensitive and caring in my close relationships_: This option includes building and maintaining caring relationships, nurturing relationships, and being responsive to the needs of others. It gives special consideration to those with whom I share a personal bond or commitment.
This additional verbiage allows a manager completing the ELSQ Rev to better understand the conceptual background of the prompt.

**Egoism**

Egoism is the ethical norm that individuals ought to do what is in their own self-interest (Sanders, 1988, p. 2–3). Describing the philosophy of egoism, *The Oxford Companion to Philosophy* poses the following question:

Does morality require a person to act for the good of others, or can its requirements be consistently seen as means to self-fulfillment for the moral agent? If the latter, some egoists will argue that only the thought of benefit or gratification to myself can in any case motivate me to actions (psychological egoism); others, ‘ethical egoists’, claim that although I could aim at the good of another, the moral life is in fact the life that maximizes good-for-me, if not always in the short term, then reliably over a lifetime. (Honderich, 2005, p. 221)

In this way, ethical egoism, a moral agent, treats the importance of one person’s happiness as greater than that of others. In *Nicomachean Ethics*, Aristotle (350 B.C./1966) argues that loving the other is a form of self-love (IX.8), which would imply that egoism and caring are not necessarily contradictory. Kant (1990), in *The Metaphysical Elements of Ethics*, identifies “our own perfection” (p. 369) as an end to be pursued. While self-centeredness and selfishness have always been common topics in philosophy, as a category of moral philosophy, ethical egoism was initially advanced by Sidgwick (1907) in *The Methods of Ethics* as a contrast to utilitarianism. Ross (1939) later uses the concept of prima facie duties to argue the existence of a duty of beneficence and a duty of self (p. 26).
The three arguments typically used to justify ethical egoism are outlined by Rachels (2008):

- “The first argument has several variations, each suggesting the same general point” (p. 534):

  Each of us is intimately familiar with our own individual wants and needs. Moreover, each of us is uniquely placed to pursue those wants and needs effectively. At the same time, we know the desires and needs of others only imperfectly, and we are not well situated to pursue them. Therefore, it is reasonable to believe that if we set out to be ‘our brother’s keeper,’ we would often bungle the job and end up doing more mischief than good. (p. 534)

To actively pursue others interests is presumptuous and officious. It is best for moral agents to mind their own business and allow others to mind theirs. To give charity is too degrading to someone as it implies that they are reliant on such gifts and unable to take care of themselves. By denying an individual value, altruism is destructive to society and to individuals, insofar as it views life merely as something to be sacrificed. Rachels (2008) quotes Rand as writing that, “if a man accepts the ethics of altruism, his first concern is not how to live his life but how to sacrifice it” (p. 535). According to Rand (1984), “the basic principle of altruism is that man has no right to exist for his own sake, that service to others is the only justification for his existence, and that self-sacrifice is his highest moral duty, virtue or value” (p. 1014). Rather, “the purpose of morality is to teach you, not to suffer and die, but to enjoy yourself and live” (Rand, 1957, p. 74.) The typically acceptable moral duties, from
not doing harm unto others, to always speaking the truth, to keeping promises, are rooted in the one fundamental principle of self-interest.

These three principles form the basis of Rachel’s (2008) justification of ethical egoism. For individuals who self-report egoistic or selfish behaviors, concerns for social desirability may suppress such reporting. In particular, measurements of selfishness have proven to be socially undesirable on the Social Desirability Scale by Phares and Erskine (1984, p. 597). This concern regarding social desirability might lead a manager with a primary leadership style of egoism not to select the prompt of egoism. Egoism in leaders has been treated by multiple researchers (Avolio & Locke, 2002; Bass & Steidlmeier, 1999).

**Egoism as an ethical leadership style**
Egoism ethics focus entirely on the self interest of the actor. In the formulation of egoism ethics, success in advancing the interests of the actor is paramount. For this reason, the core imperatives for this ethical style are as follows:

- Acts in his/her self-interest.
- Does what benefits him/her the most.
- Does not focus primarily on advancing his/her career.

The final prompt in the ELSQ Rev for the ethical leadership style of egoism is “I would do what benefits me the most.” A leader who has egoism as a primary style
would be an individual who makes a decision based on what benefits that leader the most. Such a leader’s primary concern in assessing actions would be the leader’s perception of his or her self-interest. In assessing a response to a vignette, if an option to do what benefits himself or herself the most is offered, then a leader with a primary ethical leadership style of egoism would be expected to select that option as his or her primary response. In the ELSQ Rev, the additional verbiage defining egoism reads as follows:

*I would do what benefits me the most:* This option includes achieving my goals, being successful in my assigned task, and advancing my career. It also includes doing things that are in my self-interest.

This additional verbiage allows an individual completing the ELSQ Rev to better understand the conceptual background of the prompt.
Chapter 3: Methods

The Research Problem
The purpose of this study is to create and evaluate a new version of the ELSQ by (1) rewording or replacing some of the vignettes and prompts, (2) increasing the number of vignettes, (3) using a two-option, forced-choice format with shorter vignettes rather than a Likert or percentage-based scoring system with longer vignettes, and (4) testing the new instrument on a larger sample size. It is anticipated that the new version of the ELSQ will satisfactorily identify leaders’ primary and secondary ethical leadership styles.

Research Methodology: Collaborative Instrument Development
I call the methodology I used for this dissertation the Collaborative Instrument Development Process. In instrument development, Grant and Davis (1997) have highlighted the importance of using content experts and the importance of “familiarizing these experts with the conceptual underpinnings and measurement model of the instrument” (p. 269). Research has recommended “the use of a panel of experts to maximize the likelihood of content-valid, well-constructed data collection instruments” (Davis, 1992, p. 194). Davis (1992) also emphasized the importance of pilot testing in that the researcher should consider

the panel review process as a series of steps, beginning with the first draft of an instrument and ending with the pilot testing of the instrument. When items are revised as a result of expert reviews, the
This use of a panel of experts in an iterative cycle of panel evaluations until consensus is reached is a validated method (Brown, 1968; Dalkey & Helmer, 1963; Sackman, 1974). The analysis that follows breaks each cycle into panel evaluation, survey modification, and pilot testing. Research has shown that such a method is effective in “developing causal relationships in complex economic or social phenomena, distinguishing and clarifying real and perceived human motivations, [and] exposing priorities of personal values, social goals” (Linstone and Turoff, 1975, p. 4). These methods inspired my approach to collaborative instrument development by allowing me to use panels of experts to develop causal relationships, clarify motivations, and expose priorities in values and social goals related to ethical leadership styles.

The collaborative design process
The collaborative design process I used operated across different sets of individuals according to a cyclical, three-step process. The different sets of individuals are represented as concentric circles in Figure 1. The collaborative design process is identified using three arrows in a cyclical pattern.
Figure 1. Collaborative Instrument Design Process

The sets of individuals represent different backgrounds, expertise, and functions. These sets are described in the following section. The arrows represent an iterative, cyclical process of design, pilot testing, and test-result assessment that results in assessment of the final instrument. In this way, the process can draw from all the individuals involved, and the process can evolve iteratively in continuous improvements attempts. These attempts may not always be successful, but the failure of one attempt is assessed and used to attempt an improved revision.
Implementation of collaborative instrument design

In the implementation of the collaborative instrument design process, both virtual and physical panels were used. Academic experts beyond the researcher included Peter G. Northouse (the originator of the ELSQ and one of my dissertation committee members), Michael C. Chikeleze (whose dissertation evaluated the original ELSQ), James D. Ludema (my dissertation chair), Martin J. Tracey (one of my dissertation committee members), and Mikko Ketokivi, Michael Manning, Marie DiVirgilio, Richard Woodman, Ernie Stech, Marie A. Lee, Carl Lawson, and Sandra Borden, all valued mentors and advisors. This set of academic experts is referred to in this research as the academic panel of experts. A consulting virtual panel of eleven senior business managers was organized, representing a total of over 267 years of management experience. This set of senior managers is referred to in this research as the managerial panel of experts. While four of the senior business managers were in telecommunications, there was also one manager each from government, finance, entertainment, education, engineering, insurance, and fitness. A set of 28 senior managers/doctoral candidates from Benedictine University’s Center for Values Driven Leadership (CVDL) were included in design consultation or in survey pilot testing/assessment (10 from CVDL cohort 2 and 18 from CVDL cohort 3). In this study, the managerial/doctoral candidate panel is referred to as the scholar/practitioner panel. These three panels allowed the research to draw from three different types of insights: strictly academic, strictly practice, and scholar/practitioner insights.
Ten iterative cycles can be distinguished in this research. Over these ten cycles, 33 survey versions were created: of those, nine were vignette-based with a Likert scale and 24 were brief vignettes in a two-option, forced-choice format. Cycles one and six did not complete in large-scale (defined as greater than 5 participants) pilot testing because of decisions to change the survey structure. These iterations of the collaborative instrument development process are included in Appendix G.

Pass 1 included a 11/23/2014 panel with Ludema and five doctoral candidates/senior executives and a 12/3/2014 panel with six doctoral candidates/senior executives. It also included a 7/21/2015 consultation with professor Chikeleze and an 8/8/2015 consultation with Woodman at the doctoral consortium at the Academy of Management. The feedback from the two panels included focus on the collection of “real life” ethical issues, alignment with Northouse’s ethical constructs, connections to leadership characteristics, the importance of the vignettes, and considerations of modification of question structure. This feedback was used to develop an updated version of the ELSQ with revised vignettes but did not make major changes to the survey structure. The original and this updated version of the survey are included as Appendices A and B.

Passes 2 and 3 centered around rapid prototyping at the International Leadership Association on October 15, 16, and 17, 2015. The researcher met with professors Northouse, Ludema, and Chikeleze on 10/15/2015, deciding to change to a two-
option, forced-choice format which was mocked up that night and shared by email with nine senior manager/doctorial students for feedback. This decision is discussed in the section on Prompt Structure in Chapter 3 Methods. Two meetings on 10/16/2015, one meeting on 10/17/2015, and email feedback were incorporated into a revision. A panel discussion on 10/15/2015 of two professors, two senior manager/doctoral candidates, and one senior manager collected 30 additional vignettes that were incorporated into an updated survey instrument on 11/1/2015. Having a large number of vetted vignettes was considered by the expert panels to be important. For this reason, a great deal of effort was spent by the panels in vignette generation and in dialogue regarding the vignettes. By 11/17/2015, 258 initial vignettes had been collected and sorted, based on potential for inclusion. (Twenty-one additional vignettes were submitted later for a total of 279 vignettes included in the scope of the research.) These vignettes continued to be revised throughout the collaborative instrument design process.

Pass 4 centered on pilot testing of the survey at Benedictine University’s Center for Values Driven Leadership on 11/21/2015, which included Ludema and Manning as well as 18 senior manager/doctoral candidates. The survey instrument is included as Appendix C. The resulting primary styles identified are listed in Table 2.

Table 2. 11/21/2015 Pilot Testing Results. Response Rate (N=20)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Virtue</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duty</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilitarianism</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egoism</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Strong feedback was received that the prompt for virtue was too strong (it referred to what an “exemplary leader” would do) and that at 60 questions, the survey was too long. Additionally, 15% of the managers rated with one of the three hitherto unidentified styles, suggesting that those styles might exist. Feedback from senior managers was also included and incorporated through a series of eight updates. This process is captured as pass 5.

Based on some suggestion that a forced choice offering three options might give greater statistical power, in pass 6, such an instrument was developed. When it was found to be cumbersome, its development was suspended. That survey is included as Appendix D. Pass 7 returned to the two option forced-choice format.

On 12/30/2015, Northouse and Ludema met with the researcher to review feedback. Based on that feedback, it was decided to focus on core business vignettes, to
lengthen vignettes with more emphasis on ethics and leadership, and to update the prompts. In three revisions, this feedback was incorporated into the survey in pass 8.

For pass 9, additional pilot testing of the survey was conducted at a staff meeting of Benedictine University’s Center for Values Driven Leadership on 1/20/2015, which included Ludema, Manning, DiVirgilio, two directors, and the researcher. The styles identified are listed in Table 3:

Table 3. 1/20/2016 Pilot Testing Results. Response Rate (N=6)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Virtue</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duty</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Care</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilitarianism</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egoism</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the debriefing that followed the departmental pilot testing, it was felt that the style findings reflected the organizational structure and certain staffing decisions. This suggested some applicability of style results.
In the final pass 10, across eight revisions, feedback was incorporated to strengthen further the leadership and ethical dimensions of the survey. The prompts for virtue and egoism were set and consensus was reached on 3/2/2016.

The Changes to the ELSQ

Main dimensions of changes
Given the theoretical presumptions and the principle components of the ELSQ, areas of modification can be delineated into the following categories:

- The ELSQ framework: while the current interpretation of the ELSQ engenders the search for a dominant style, there are alternative perspectives in interpreting the results.
- The demographics: the set of existing demographic could be reformulated.
- The specific styles: while the existing ESLQ has six styles, that set of six may be added to or subtracted from.
- The vignettes: while the existing ESLQ has five vignettes, those could be edited, added to, or deleted from.
- The prompts: the questions used to identify the prioritized concern could be reworked. Also, instead of having one prompt per style, multiple questions per style could be used.
- The response structure: the current version uses both Likert and percentage-based format responses. One of those structures, an alternative structure, or multiple alternative structures could be used. For instance, a choice-based structure
alternative might be used. Rather than having one question for each style, a
vignette might have one possible solution associated each style and the
respondent could rank the solutions.

Each of these dimensions will be discussed in the following sections.

**The ELSQ framework**

In the work of Chikeleze (2014), much of the analysis centers on identifying the
dominant style for a respondent. In particular, the dominant style for the Likert
percentage-based results are compared. While the current interpretation of the ELSQ
has focused on the search for a dominant style, the results might be analyzed
differently. In particular, it has been suggested (D. Woodman, personal
communication, August 8, 2015) that interpretation might rather focus on a “style
profile” that focused different style preference patterns, or some importance might be
given to the styles that are not primary. In the analysis of conflict resolution styles,
the perspective of style profiles has been profitably applied (Gabrielidis, Stephan,
Ybarra, Pearson, & Villareal, 1997; Hendel, Fish, & Galon, 2005; Pearson &
Stephan, 1998). From another perspective, managers may differentially apply
concerns in ethical dilemmas (Bazerman & Tenbrunsel, 2011; Rogerson, Gottlieb,
Handelsman, Knapp, & Younggren, 2011). While ethical styles are substantially
different than conflict resolution or ethical dilemmas as posed by Rogerson et al.
(2011), structurally, the same dynamic may be at work in the ELSQ. Applying the
style profile paradigm, it may be that the variance in the six different styles is best
characterized as a set of style profiles. Then it would be possible to analyze other characteristics that differ between those styles. Or possibly by raising the issue of the six different styles specifically, the respondent recognizes important perspectives that they would not have considered otherwise. If this is the case, the respondent’s behavior without such secondary styles being illuminated may be different than when those secondary styles are illuminated.

The demographics
In the area of demographics, a number of measures are included in the ELSQ:

- Age in years,
- Gender,
- Level of education,
- Number of years in management, and
- Number of employees reporting.

In order to collect as little personal information as possible, it was desired to use age ranges rather than a specific numbered age. The revised age question is,

1. What is your age in years?
   - 18-29
   - 30-44
   - 45-59
   - 60 or older
Regarding the construct of gender, including an option of “prefer not to answer” was considered. However, it was felt that it would not be possible to collect sufficient data for that demographic to be statistically significant, so the gender question is,

2. What is your gender?
   - Male
   - Female

For the construct of level of education, consistency with Survey Monkey databases was desired so that set of options was originally used. However, the inclusion of “professional certifications” was found to be confusing, and so that option was deleted.

3. What is the highest level of education you have completed? (select one)
   - Some high school, no diploma
   - High school graduate or equivalent (e.g., GED)
   - Some college, no degree
   - Associate degree
   - Bachelor degree
   - Master degree
   - Doctoral degree

To protect manager anonymity, ranges rather than years were used for years of management experience. Because of feedback on confusion with this question, the parenthetical information that the years need not be consecutive was added:
4. What is your number of total years in management (years need not be consecutive):
   - 0-5
   - 6-10
   - 11-15
   - 16-20
   - 21 or more

Chikeleze (2014) noted confusion over whether the original demographic question covered both direct and indirect reports (p. 78). Because of that and additional other feedback received, a parenthetical clarification was added that reporting employees may report directly or indirectly:

5. What is the largest number of employees who have reported to you (either directly or indirectly)? ______

The original research on ELSQ was administered at four particular companies, so the industry of each site was known. Because the intention is to share the revised survey electronically and thus more broadly than application at fixed locations, a question regarding industry is an appropriate addition. To allow for future use of Survey Monkey databases, which use set industry definitions, consistency with Survey Monkey format is desirable. For that reason, the following question is proposed:
What industry do you currently work in?
□ Advertising/Marketing
□ Agriculture
□ Airline or Aerospace (including Defense)
□ Automotive
□ Business Support or Logistics
□ Construction
□ Machinery or Homes
□ Education
□ Entertainment or Leisure
□ Finance or Financial Services
□ Food and Beverages
□ Government
□ Health Care or Pharmaceuticals
□ Insurance
□ Law Enforcement
□ Manufacturing
□ Religious or Nonprofit
□ Retail or Consumer Durables
□ Real Estate
□ Telecommunications
□ Technology, Internet, or Electronics
□ Utilities, Energy, or Extraction
□ Other __________________

In addition to the industry demographic, feedback has been received that it would be useful to add a region demographic, asking for the respondent’s the region (e.g., Europe, Africa, etc.) or a specific prompt asking for their country. This demographic could be useful in distinguishing regional differences. Such differences may manifest as differences in the styles that are evident, the distribution of styles present, or the profiles of styles that are identified. For these reasons, a prompt for country has been included.
The specific styles
The six ethical styles in the ELSQ represent those commonly found in the literature rather than an exhaustive set (Chikeleze 2014, p. 430). As such, other ethical styles may exist. Some support for the set of styles used can be defended based on the work of MacIntyre (1984). In *After Virtue*, MacIntyre (1984) argues that fragmentation has left society in “in a state of grave disorder” (p. 238). In this fractured state, “modern moral utterance and practice can only be understood as a series of fragmented survivals from an older past” (MacIntyre, 1984, p. 257) of former ethical systems. As tracing the genesis of these styles in Chapter 2 has revealed, the background of the ethical styles touches the roots of many of the foundational ethical systems of western civilization—e.g., the ethical systems of Aristotle, Hume, Kant, and Mill—so that there is reason to consider that these styles may to some degree exist as fragments of those systems that survive in modern culture. This sentiment is echoed in the claim by British philosopher Williams (1986) that we are the heirs of a complex and rich philosophical tradition where a variety of different moral considerations and ethical principles intertwine and sometimes compete with each other (p. 16). While these six styles may claim some potential roots in these systems, these claims are not exclusive, and other potential styles could be proposed from other ethical systems.

In panel reviews, some consistency across prompts was considered and piloted in several vignettes. At one point, the prepositional phrase “in this situation” was included in each prompt to emphasize the situational nature of each evaluation. At another point, “best” was used in each prompt to emphasize that other concerns might
exist and the most optimal was sought. In pilot testing, these components did not prove significantly valuable, and they were removed in favor of simpler, more straightforward formulations. As the ELSQ is designed to assess how managers choose an ethical action, it is appropriate to start the prompts consistently with the introduction “I would do….” This formulation was positively received in pilot testing.

As for the duty, virtue, and distributive justice styles that were identified (Chikeleze, 2014), these would seem to be candidates to retain; however, clearer wording of these prompts for these styles may assist in distinguishing other styles such that they appear in the survey results. Distinguishing the styles is intimately related to the wording of the prompts. The exact wording of the style prompts was a topic of intense research investigation and extensive pilot testing. The following reviews summarize that research. To better clarify the meaning of the prompts, a section describing them was added to the later survey versions. In addition, in the online survey, an option was provided so that the manager taking the survey could refer to the descriptions at any point. Unfortunately, comments from at least one responding manager suggested that they did not see the button allowing the display of the descriptions. For this reason, the understanding of the prompts may not have been as clear as possible.

During the research process, 44 versions of prompts were considered. Some went through evaluation by an expert panel and were rejected. Others proceeded to pilot
testing for evaluation. The number of prompt versions varied by style with a minimum of five versions and a maximum of 13 versions:

- **Virtue**: 15 versions in seven categories.
- **Distributive justice**: five versions.
- **Duty**: six versions.
- **Utilitarianism**: five versions.
- **Caring**: seven versions.
- **Egoism**: six versions.

Each of the prompt versions will be reviewed according to the associated style in the following paragraphs.

Settling the virtue prompt proved more challenging than any other prompt. More than twice as many virtue prompts were evaluated than any other prompt. Concerns in assessing any potential virtue prompt included distinguishing the virtue style from other styles and addressing any social desirability concerns.

To assist in virtue prompt creation, a word association was administered to 14 senior managers. This word association was also done to evaluate content validity. The results of the word association can be seen in Table 4:

**Table 4. Virtue Prompt Word Association (N=14)**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Principled</th>
<th>Character</th>
<th>Virtuous</th>
<th>Honorable</th>
<th>Exemplary</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Principled</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honorable</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Righteous</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Incorruptible</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtuous</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honest</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Worthy</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Admirable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High-Mindedness</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This survey found that many individuals have some negative associations with the term “virtue.” And many had associations with the term “character” that reflected an unusual personality. While the term “good” had a fundamental basis in classical philosophy, concern existed that it might be too broad or have a social desirability
bias. Through repeated pilot testing and feedback evaluations of alternative prompts, the advantages and disadvantages of those potential prompts were identified for the most promising potential virtue prompts. These considerations are included in Appendix H.

The original prompt for the style of virtue was “doing what an exemplary leader would do in this situation.” “Exemplary” (n.d.) is defined as “serving as a pattern: or “deserving imitation.” In contrast, “virtue” (n.d.) is defined as “conformity to a standard of right,” or “a particular moral excellence,” or “a commendable quality or trait.” Here, the word “exemplary” has a more general denotation of “deserving imitation,” while the word “virtue” has more of a moral denotation. Pilot testing of the exemplary prompt led to consensus that it was “too strong.” Trials with “act with character” found that formulation to be awkward.

As the narrower formulations proved problematic, a broader formulation based on the word “good” was the least problematic of the available options. With additional clarification in the instructions, the prompt may be broader without sacrificing the clarity of the respondent’s understanding of the style. Given the broad positive connotation of the word “good,” considerable concern over social desirability was raised; however, in pilot testing the social desirability concerns were greater with formulations using the terms “exemplary” or “honorable.”
For determination of the prompt for the distributive justice style, five different prompt versions were evaluated. A summary of these considerations is included in Appendix I.

The original prompt for the distributive justice style was “concerned about treating everyone fairly” (Chikeleze, 2014, p. 86). Feedback from some respondents taking the ESQL revealed that they found the interpretation of “fairly” to be somewhat problematic. Often it was rhetorically asked “fair to whom?” since different parties in the vignettes often have contrary perspectives. In pilot testing, the options such as “just” or “equitable” had the same issue. Using “fair” was considered simpler, more straightforward, and less complex than using notions of “justice” or “equality.” In the end, it was decided to stay with “fair” as the core prompt, but for simplicity, to formulate the prompt, “I would do what is fair.”

For the determination of the prompt for the duty ethical style, six duty prompt versions were considered. A summary of these discussions is included in Appendix J.

The original prompt for the duty style was “fulfilling my obligations as leader in charge” (Chikeleze, 2014, p. 98). Each word in this prompt could be dissected, but for the purposes of this discussion, it is sufficient to review the definition of “obligation.” It might have been expected that the duty style would use the term “duty” rather than “obligation.” “Oblige” (n.d.) is defined as “to constrain by physical, moral, or legal
force or by the exigencies of circumstance.” The denotation of this definition calls out constraint by a physical, moral, legal, or circumstantial dimension. In contrast, the definition of “duty” (n.d.) in this context is “conduct due to parents and superiors” or “obligatory tasks, conduct, service, or functions that arise from one’s position (as in life or in a group),” or “a moral or legal obligation.” Given these definitions, it is apparent that “obligation” has a broader scope than “duty,” since “obligation” refers to a broad range of “exigencies of circumstance,” in comparison to “duty,” which refers more specifically to “parents and superiors” or to “one’s position.” As in the ESLQ, the desire is to focus on business leadership relationships that are often relationships of superiority of one position in relation to another, so the use of the word “duty” is preferred over “obligation” on this basis. Since “responsibility” (n.d.) has a definition of “a duty or task that you are required or expected to do,” it also lacks the focus on one’s position. As leadership is a position, and the ELSQ seeks to evaluate leadership, the inclusion of a relation to position is of value, and for this reason, the word “duty” is preferred over the other terms evaluated in this review.

While these styles of duty, virtue, and distributive justice were identified (Chikeleze, 2014), the three styles of caring, egoism, and utilitarianism were not identified as a predominant style for a significant number of managers. Thus their review deserves special critique.
For the determination of the prompt for the utilitarianism ethical style, five utilitarian prompt versions were considered. These considerations are summarized in Appendix K.

The original prompt for utilitarianism was “making sure more people benefitted by the outcome than were hurt by it.” Of the three that did not rate as significant, this style had the highest average score across the vignettes. This prompt is longer than the other prompts in general and somewhat awkwardly worded. The prompt is vague in that a large number of people might have a small benefit and a only slightly smaller number have a very large negative impact. As worded, it could have a connotation related to democratic voting per person rather than a summing of utility across people. While simpler and more positive, a formulation based on “helping the most people” was found to be confused with the caring style. Two other formulations that were closer to the core concepts of utilitarianism were evaluated, but both proved problematic in pilot testing. For simplicity and clarity (as reflected in pilot testing), the final prompt selected was “I would do what benefits the most people.” In this selection, the notion of “benefit” was considered closer to utility than options such as “best.” The use of the instruction text was seen as a more effective manner of communication of the description of the complex style of utilitarianism, rather than attempting to craft a very complex prompt.
For the determination of the prompt for the caring ethical style, seven caring prompt versions were considered. These considerations are summarized in Appendix L.

The original prompt for caring was “determining how this situation would affect my close work relationships.” Caring had by a significant margin a lower average response rate than any other style in the ELSQ, so more significant adjustments may be needed in this prompt. This prompt is one of the longest. It also seems to have a neutral connotation, as it does not determine whether the affect is positive or negative. Some suggested imperatives that are more positive and closer to Gilligan’s (1982) definition would be

- Builds caring relationships: while this could be advantageous, as it includes the actual word “caring,” in discussions with reviewers, this word was sometimes interpreted as having a predominantly emotional connotation, which was not intended by Gilligan.

- Builds good relationships: this is not as warm as caring but could have both cognitive and emotional connotations.

- Maintains and nurtures relationships: this terminology is also used by Gilligan and would be closer to her express definitions.

- Is sensitive in close relationships: this formulation brings out the importance of emotive connection in relationships.
Based on the conceptual background and pilot feedback, it is considered valuable to include the key notions of “care” and “relationship.” Given feedback that in every business situation, a basic sense of relationship (e.g., subordinate, superior, peer, etc.) exists, a distinction of the importance of close relationships is important. The conceptual background also suggested that inclusion of notions of “sensitivity,” “maintaining,” “nurturing,” and “responsiveness” is important. Pilot testing suggested that while including the term “caring” implied the notions of “maintaining,” “nurturing,” and “responsiveness,” it did not imply the notion of sensitivity as directly. For this reason, inclusion of the notion of “sensitivity” is considered important, while inclusion of the other notions is not as important. To capture these varied concepts, a longer prompt was accepted: “I would be sensitive and caring in my close relationships.” This was felt to best capture the conceptual framework in the ethical style of caring.

For the determination of the prompt for the egoism ethical style, six egoism prompt versions were considered. These considerations are summarized in Appendix M.

The original prompt for the egoism style was “making sure my own goals as leader are satisfied.” This formulation begged the issue of what the leader’s goals might be since they might be justice or some other style. Egoism had the second lowest average score—higher only than caring. It could also be that the use of “goals as leader” confuses this style with duty in the mind of the participant.
Strong feedback from both panel review and pilot testing suggested that the egoism style appears selfish, creating some social desirability effect. This concern was raised on all the versions of the egoism prompt.

Versions of the egoism prompt that focused on being the leader or on career were rejected, as they were potentially perceived as eliminating some important personal dimensions of egoism and emphasizing elements of duty. The later versions of the egoism prompt focused on the notions of “self interest,” “best interest,” and “benefits me.” Of these, in panel evaluation and pilot feedback, the “benefits me” formulation was rated more positive than the others and rated as having the least social desirability concern. Using the notion of “benefits” for the egoism prompt is considered to provide a balancing, parallel formulation relative to the utilitarianism prompt of “I would do what benefits the most people.” The final formulation for the egoism style prompt is “I would do what benefits me the most.”

While the lack of identification of the styles of utilitarianism, caring, and egoism by Chikileze (2014) might suggest that those styles do not exist, the issues identified here with the prompts and below with the vignettes suggest that prompt creation is so complex that it may be premature to reach such a conclusion. For that reason, none of these styles was deleted.
Another consideration might be adding a style. Based on the literature review above, the inclusion of honesty and trust as separate from fairness might be considered. However, until the identified issues with the current styles are settled, this might be a premature complication. The identification of other styles is left to future research.

The final prompts for the survey and the previous prompts are summarized in Table 5:

Table 5. ELSQ Prompts
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethical Style</th>
<th>ELSQ</th>
<th>ELSQ Revised</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Virtue Ethics</td>
<td>Doing what an exemplary leader would do in this situation</td>
<td>I would do what a good person would do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Justice Ethics</td>
<td>Concerned about treating everyone fairly.</td>
<td>I would do what is fair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egoism Ethics</td>
<td>Making sure my own goals as leader are satisfied.</td>
<td>I would do what benefits me the most.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilitarian Ethics</td>
<td>Making sure more people benefitted by the outcome than were hurt by it</td>
<td>I would do what benefits the most people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duty Ethics</td>
<td>Fulfilling my obligations as leader in charge.</td>
<td>I would do my duty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(Alternatively described as “creates a participative and open work environment because she believes that every employee has a right to be heard.)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring Ethics</td>
<td>Determining how this situation would affect my close work relationships.</td>
<td>I would be sensitive and caring in my close relationships.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Chikeleze, 2014*

**The vignettes**
In the revision of the ELSQ, the five vignettes identified might be redefined, added to, or deleted from. While the initial revisions in pass 1 focused on reformulating the original vignettes with additional material, the later passes all focused on adding vignettes.
Redefining the original five vignettes

The analysis in this section relates to the first version of changes to the ELSQ, which are incorporated in the pass 1 survey and included as Appendix B. The five vignettes from the original survey are

1. Employee with alcohol problem,
2. Process changes,
3. Sexual harassment,
4. Bonus allocation, and
5. Single mother.

Figure 2 shows a chart comparing the Likert results per vignette and per style:

![Chart](image)

Figure 2. Average Scores by Style and Vignette.
The process changes vignette seems to differ significantly from the other areas with lower scores on exemplary and fair. The sexual harassment vignette seems to differ a bit with somewhat lower scores in goals and relationships. Distinguishing the questions, these results beg the question of whether the process question could be edited to emphasize dimensions of fairness and exemplariness to a greater extent. Across all the questions, this data begs the question of whether the dimensions, especially of relationships and goals and also benefitted, can be emphasized. The questions do appear to miss many of the dimensions of clear and pressing managerial goals. And even more so, the questions are devoid of the “thick” description that Gilligan suggests might describe the personal particular character of caring relationships within the ethics of care.

Only questions 1 and 5 have a small amount of environmental information (e.g., describing the company and the number of people in the workgroup.). This lack of personal information could lower readers’ emphasis on personal dimensions, such as personal relationships with others (caring) or their own personal goals in the vignette (egoism).

One additional vignette suggested in interviews with respondents is that of needing to lay off an employee. This has been identified by several managers as one of the most difficult managerial decisions to make. This could potentially be added as a vignette. Alternatively, vignette 2, which seems to have somewhat anomalous results, could be
removed. However, since it indicated significant rewriting, it would seem premature to add or delete vignettes.

The following bullet list summarizes the feedback by vignette:

1. Alcohol problem—might be a trigger for those who have experienced emotionally charged vignettes with alcohol in the past.

2. Process changes—this seems very abstractly worded and, as such, difficult to apply caring to as a style. This question averaged low in the areas of exemplary and fair.

3. Sexual harassment—might be a trigger for those who have experienced emotionally charged vignettes with sexual harassment in the past. This was identified as potentially having a social desirability effect. This vignette rated low in the areas of goals and relationship.

4. Bonus allocation—might be a trigger for those who have experienced emotionally charged vignettes with bonuses in the past. This vignette rated a bit high in benefitted and relationships.

5. Single mother—might be a trigger for those who have experienced emotionally charged vignettes with child care in the past. This was identified as potentially having a social desirability effect.

This vignette feedback suggested a rewrite of the existing five vignettes, which was performed. The revised survey incorporating this feedback is included in Appendix B.
An alternative consideration was a choice-based structure where the styles were embedded in a particular selection. For instance:

Situation: You are the manager of a six member accounting group for a small company that is losing money and downsizing. As a result you have to select a group member to layoff. Yet you also have demands to increase productivity. Jack is a personal friend and a well-liked, high performing team member for over twenty years. You badly need to keep him as he has unique talents but he is approaching retirement. Jim is a new employee and a strong performer; however you have caught him submitting a false meal voucher on a business trip. Terry is the lowest performing member of the group; but Terry is struggling with supporting her family, has long service with the company, and is the daughter of your manager. Bill is a solid employee, but is greatly disliked by the President of the company for being outspoken in meetings. Letting Bill go will greatly increase your status in the President’s mind. Tina is the group secretary and is a solid, hard worker outside of your group in the secretarial pool. If Tina was let go, people in your group could equally share her responsibilities; however that would be very inefficient.

Layoff Selections: Please identify
My first choice to layoff would be: ______________
My first choice to layoff would be: ______________
My second choice to layoff would be: ______________
My third choice to layoff would be: ______________
My fourth choice to layoff would be: ______________
My fifth choice to layoff would be: ______________
My sixth and last choice to layoff would be: ______________

While in some ways, the choice-based structure offered a simpler formation, the lack of the inclusion of the style description in each prompt made the content validity of
each choice dependent on the subjective structure of the vignette description. For this reason, consideration of the choice-based structure was suspended.

**Beyond redefining the original five vignettes**
The analysis in this section applies to the ELSQ revisions that were made from pass 2 through pass 10 of the research process. Examples of these surveys (including the final version of the survey) are included as Appendices C, D, and E.

Once the decision had been made to use a forced-choice format with two choices, evaluation of the optimal number of questions was based on the desire to collect sufficient data without extending the duration of the test such that the time commitment would discourage participation. Since the desire was to try and keep the duration of the survey to 15 minutes, based on survey timings, a target of 45 questions was set. The strategy was set to grow the survey to 60 questions and then use a large pilot test to choose the best 45 questions out of that set of 60 questions. The best 45 questions would then be included in the large-scale data collection. The hope was that from the results of the large-scale data collection on the 45 questions, a suitable 15-question version of the survey might be extracted. Unfortunately, as vignettes were elaborated to strengthen certain dimensions (such as ethics and leadership), the duration of the survey increased until 20 minutes was a median duration with some individuals taking significantly more time to complete the survey.
The 45 vignettes selected for the final survey were selected from a set of 279 vignettes, using expert reviews and pilot testing. They were repeatedly screened with special attention to ensure that the vignettes engendered clear and strong components of ethics and leadership. In addition, the questions were screened to validate that any of the six styles was a reasonable potential response.

The prompts
The original ELSQ structure covers six ethical styles.” For each of the six ethical styles, a single prompt is used (a one-to-one mapping). Because of the numerous aspects of each style, the selection of a single style prompt necessarily left out some aspects of the definition of that style. Rather than try to capture the essence of a style in one prompt, using three prompts per style and averaging the results for the prompt score was considered. In this way, a number of aspects (or imperatives) of the style could be used in the assessment of each ethical style. Prospective imperatives considered for each style are identified in the Table 6:
Table 6. Mapping of Imperatives to Styles

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ethical Style</th>
<th>Imperatives</th>
<th>Original style prompt</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caring Ethics</td>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>Determining how this situation would affect my close work relationships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Compassionate</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nurturing</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Justice Ethics</td>
<td>Just</td>
<td>Concerned about treating everyone fairly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equitable</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duty Ethics</td>
<td>Duty (given role? Others)</td>
<td>Fulfilling my obligations as leader in charge.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Respect rights of others</td>
<td>Creates a participative and open work environment because she believes that every employee has a right to be heard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Treats others as people not things</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egoism Ethics</td>
<td>Success in mission</td>
<td>Making sure my own goals as leader are satisfied.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Career advancement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is in my self interest</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtue Ethics</td>
<td>Character</td>
<td>Doing what an exemplary leader would do in this situation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Integrity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Principles</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilitarian Ethics</td>
<td>Greatest good for the greatest number</td>
<td>Making sure more people benefitted by the outcome than were hurt by it.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Helps the most people overall</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Produces the greatest happiness</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the inclusion of multiple style prompts would better define the styles in the mind of the respondent, the inclusion three imperatives per style would result in three times as many questions in the questionnaire. With six styles, at a minimum to cover all style combinations, 15 comparisons would be needed (6*5/2). With two or three prompts per style, the number of comparisons increases to 54 (12*9/2) or 135 (18*15/2), respectfully. Ideally, for comparison purposes, at least three or four sets of
combinations would be useful. For this reason, using multiple prompts per style would dramatically increase the length of the questionnaire. With a limited survey duration, and with both the number of vignettes and the number of prompt questions included increasing the duration of the survey, a trade-off between the number of vignettes and the number of prompt questions was necessary. Testing style preferences across a number of vignettes is a core element of the survey design. For proper description of the styles, more than the description included in a single prompt was considered necessary. Rather than introducing multiple prompts, which might introduce variance across those prompts, the introduction of an instructions section that more clearly defines the styles was suggested. Multiple requests for such a section were received in feedback from survey respondents. For the online version, it was suggested that for every question a button be provided to allow reference to the instruction descriptions. (This was included.) The additional instruction for clarification of the meaning of the styles removed the need for multiple prompts.

When the prompts were rewritten, attention was given to consistency, simplicity, and clarity. Many cycles of expert feedback and pilot testing were completed before consensus was reached on the final prompts. Some of the versions of the prompts over time are shown in Appendix N.
The response structure
In reviewing the data from Chikeleze’s research, some surveys stood out. Some of the Likert survey responses showed the selection of the same value across all the style prompts. Some of the percentage-based survey responses did not total to 100, suggesting that respondents may have had trouble weighing six different dimensions at once. In addition, Chikeleze (2014) found “the [percentage-based] scales had far fewer ties with the predominant style and other styles than the Likert scale.” (p. 76). These concerns suggested abandoning a Likert or six-way, percentage-based response structure. A two-alternative, forced-choice structure was suggested by Ludema (J. Ludema, personal communication, October 15, 2015). Given the success of a similar format in the VIA Strengthsfinder, the multiple forced-choice response structure provided a proven structure that avoided the aforementioned issues identified in the previous ELSQ results.

The vignettes were ordered at random. One key design feature in the survey is that the prompts were all assigned to vignettes at random. As feedback received may have had the effect of tailoring some vignettes to the prompts offered, the prompts were randomly reshuffled immediately before the survey was finalized in order to remove any potential feedback prompt bias. While the vignettes and prompts are random, the vignettes are segmented such that a full complement of the 15 style pairings are included between questions 1–15, 16–30, and 31–45.
After each vignette is presented, the responder is prompted, “What would you do in this situation? (Choose one.)” Two prompts are then presented for the manager to select. For consistency, both of the prompts begin with “I would do.”

**Survey final modification summary**
The changes made are summarized thusly:

- The demographics: inclusion of a query regarding industry and country. In addition, the demographic questions were worked and the question options offered were revised.
- The styles included: the consensus was that without additional research into the existing styles, it is premature to add or subtract styles.
- The vignettes: 45 were chosen out of 279 collected, based on expert review and pilot testing until consensus was reached.
- The prompts: the six prompts were rewritten several times based on expert review and pilot testing until consensus was reached.

Similar to the original survey, the final survey starts with a brief introduction, explaining the questions included, the two-alternative format, the duration of the survey, and the anonymity of the survey. The survey ends thanking the respondent for completing the survey. This makes the structure of the survey as follows:

- Introduction,
- Demographic information,
• Instructions,
• Vignettes, and
• Closing “thank you.”

The final survey administered is included as Appendix E.

**Administration of the Revised ELSQ**
This research study was conducted online using a snowball technique from March 3, 2016, to March 31, 2016. The survey was implemented as a custom application built on the GoDaddy application platform to be supported on any internet web browser. Based on online pilot feedback, changes for usability were included, such as improved instructions, a progress bar, ergonomic improvements, and a graphical result display.

**Participants**
The 106 managers participating in the study came from 17 different specific industries with 17 managers choosing “other” as their industry. The ELSQ Rev population demographics can be summarized thusly:

• ELSQ Rev average age is 51.4 years.
• ELSQ Rev gender is 55.7% female.
• ELSQ Rev education level is 66% graduate.
• ELSQ Rev average years of management experience is 14.4.
• ELSQ Rev average number of employees reporting is 76.5.
Further demographic information is reviewed in Chapter 4 Results.

**Data collection**
The anticipated duration of taking the ELSQ was 15 minutes for the pilot versions, which only included the percentage-based scale, and 25 minutes for the validation version, which included both the Likert and the percentage-based scales. Participants were instructed not to put their name or any identifying information on the form to ensure that information collection was anonymous and confidential. Survey data was collected, processed, and analyzed using Excel Spreadsheet software and SPSS statistical computer software.

**Data analysis**
Descriptive statistics generated include means, frequency distributions, correlations, and reliability metrics. The means and frequency distributions were computed using Excel and were used for associating results with ethical leadership styles and to look for variations across the demographic variables. The other parameters, including correlations and reliability metrics, were calculated using the SPSS statistical software program. In particular, the correlation between the Likert percentage-based scales, the reliability of the instrument, and the number of primary ethical leadership styles was determined using SPSS-based analysis of results.
The implementation of an online survey was recommended by Chikeleze (2014, p. 86) for a number of reasons. Consistent with this recommendation, the survey was placed online at www.ELSQsurvey.com on 3/3/2016, and 106 usable surveys were collected by 3/31/2016, which met the target of 100 surveys to assess the six styles. As surveys were solicited with a snowball technique, the number of managers solicited is not known, but direct solicitations were known to have gone out to at least 747 managers, of whom 88 committed to pass on the request. This would reflect a response rate in the first 22 days no higher than 14.3% (the website remains active, collecting surveys). After managers were initially contacted, a request for feedback on their experience was sent five days later. If the manager responded that they would take the survey later, then they were send another request for feedback three days later. If they responded with feedback, they were asked to forward the survey if they found the survey useful. In each email, the managers were thanked for their participation.

Data analysis includes detailed descriptive analysis, followed by analysis of the data for themes and issues. For this analysis, the procedures from Creswell (2007) and Roassman and Rallis (1998) are used.

Given the sensitive of nature of discussions of ethical dilemmas, a number of precautions were needed. All discussions were only of hypothetical ethical dilemmas, which are stripped of any identifying detail. Notes and/or transcripts were made that
were stripped of any identifying names, organizations, or other details. Given the sensitive nature of the topic, videotaping was not done. Descriptive and reflexive notes were taken during and immediately after the face-to-face interviews. No identifying data was collected. Surveys only collected anonymous data. Surveys were numbered without association to any name. The files were stored on the researcher’s password-protected computer in a secure environment accessible only to the researcher. The data was backed up and stored on a password-protected laptop owned and used solely by the researcher that is stored in a secure environment. Any hard copies of the data were kept securely in a locked filing cabinet in the researcher’s home. The researcher’s notes, memos, journal, and any hand coding work were also stored in the locked filing cabinet. Any data printed out that is not used and thus stored in the locked filing cabinet will be shredded prior to disposal by the researcher. At the conclusion of the project, all data will be transmitted to Jim Ludema, Director of the Center for Values-Driven Leadership at Benedictine University, for secure and ultimate disposal after a period of seven years. This procedure was approved by the Benedictine University Institutional Review Board.
Chapter 4: Results

For clarity, in the following section, the original ELSQ reviewed by Chikeleze (2014) is referred to as ELSQ. The final version of the updated version of the ELSQ developed in this research is referred to as ELSQ Rev.

Response Rate
As surveys were solicited with a snowball technique, the number of managers solicited is not known, but direct solicitations were known to have gone out to at least 747 managers, of whom 88 committed to pass on the request. The collection of 106 complete surveys by 3/31/2016 reflects a 14.3% response rate in the first 22 days (the website remains active, collecting surveys). Two incomplete surveys were received. It is suspected that these incomplete surveys were received because of problems with the respondent’s web browser. After managers were initially contacted, a request for feedback on their experience was sent five days later. If the manager responded that they would take the survey later, then they were sent another request for feedback three days later. If they responded with feedback, they were asked to forward the survey if they found the survey useful. In each email, the managers were thanked for their participation.
**Demographics**

The demographics in the ELSQ cover age, gender, level of education, number of years in management, number of employees who report to the respondent, industry, and country. The sample population demographics are diverse across industries, age, gender, education, and experience. For populations not characterized by these demographics, these results may not apply.

**Age**

For the ELSQ, the range of participant age is from 30 to 60, with an average age of 41, as illustrated in Table 7.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>30-39</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>40%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40-49</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-55</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>94%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Adapted from Chikeleze 2014, p. 59*

Using the midpoints of the age ranges as the average age for that range, and assuming 65 as the average age for the 60+ category, the average age for the 106 managers in the ELSQ Rev data collection is 51.4 years old, as illustrated in Table 8.
Table 8. ELSQ Rev Participant Age (N=106)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-29</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-44</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>17.9%</td>
<td>24.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-59</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>45.3%</td>
<td>69.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60+</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>30.2%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This increase of 10.4 years in the average age represents a 25.4% increase from the ELSQ. Thus in terms of age, the ELSQ Rev population is significantly older.

**Gender**

In terms of gender, the participants in the ELSQ include 10 female managers who constitute 30% of the managers and 23 male managers who constitute 70% of the managers, as illustrated in Table 9.

Table 9. ELSQ Participant Gender (N=33)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Chikeleze, 2014, p. 59*
For the ELSQ Rev, in terms of gender, the participants include 59 female managers, representing 55.7% of the managers, and 47 male managers, representing 44.3% of the managers, as illustrated in Table 10.

Table 10. ELSQ Rev Participant Gender (N=106)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>44.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

These data represent a swing from approximately 40% fewer women to approximately 9% more women in the survey population. In this demographic, the ELSQ Rev is more balanced in terms of gender, and it also has a larger sample size (N=106 rather than N=33). This larger, more balanced sample provides a larger data set for the investigation of demographical variations.

**Education**

The educational demographic information in the ELSQ distinguishes three highest levels of education: high school, college, and graduate. For the ELSQ, a total of 7 participants in the study selected graduate education, which represents 24% of the population, as illustrated in Table 11.

Table 11. Participant Education (N=33)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>64%</td>
<td>76%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Graduate</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Adapted from Chikeleze, 2104, p. 59*

For the ELSQ Rev, the educational demographic information regarding highest level of education completed is segmented into six categories: high school, some college, associate, bachelors, masters, and doctorate. Combining the masters and doctorate responses in the ELSQ yields 70 respondents representing 66% of the population, as illustrated in Table 12.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 12. ELSQ Rev Education (N=106)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Highest Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High school</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Masters</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With the ELSQ reporting a 24% graduate population and the ELSQ Rev reporting a 66% graduate population, the level of education reported is significantly higher in the ELSQ Rev. Since associates of Benedictine University’s Center for Values Driven
Leadership were solicited as respondents, that segment of the population may have affected the average level of education reported.

**Years in management**
The ELSQ queries managers on their number of year in management, and responses range from 2 to 31, with an average of 11. The population of managers with 20 or more years of management experience for the ELSQ included 4 managers, representing 12% of the population, as shown in Table 13.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yrs Mgmt Experience</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>61%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-19</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>87%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;30</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Adapted from Chikeleze, 2014, p. 60*

The ELSQ Rev queries managers on their number of years in management, offering five categories: 5 or less, 6 to 10, 11 to 15, 16 to 20, and 21 or more. Using the midpoint of the ranges as the average duration, and using 25 years as the average for
the 20 or more category, the average years of experience for the ELSQ Rev is 14.4 years, as shown in Table 14.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yrs Mgmt Experience</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;5</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>38.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>50.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>67.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21+</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This difference in average years of experience from 11 years in the ELSQ to 14.4 years in the ELSQ Rev represents a 30.1% longer tenure in management for the population in the ELSQ Rev. This represents significantly higher management experience in the ELSQ Rev (30.1%), with only a small increase in average age (2.8%).

**Number of employees**
Managers identify the number of employees reporting to them in the ELSQ. The number of reporting employees ranges from 0 to 99, with an average of 20 in the ELSQ. If the outlying response of 99 results is removed, then the average of is 15 employee reporting. Table 15 delineates the number of reports.
Table 15. ELSQ Participant Employee Reports (N=35)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Reports</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-19</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>64%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>85%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;30</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Chikeleze, 2014, p. 61

In the ELSQ Rev, managers identify the number of employees reporting to them directly or indirectly. The number of reporting employees ranges from 0 to 1102, with an average of 76.5 employees. If the two outlying results over 1000 employees are removed, then the average is 56.8 employees reporting. Table 16 delineates the number of employee reports for the ELSQ Rev.

Table 16. ELSQ Rev Participant Employee Reports (N=106)
### Number of Reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Reports</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-9</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
<td>43.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10-19</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
<td>59.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20-29</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>67.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30-49</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>69.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50-99</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>80.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100-199</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.3%</td>
<td>92.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200-599</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>97.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>600-1102</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The ELSQ Rev yields an average number of employees reporting as 76.5 employees, compared to 20 employees for the ELSQ, so the population in the revised survey is much larger (282%). Removing outliers yields a 56.8 employee span for the ELSQ Rev, compared to a 15 employee span for the ELSQ, which remains a large variation (279%).

**Industry**

Five particular companies participated in the ELSQ, which included 33 qualified managers. All of the surveys were fully completed and valid. The companies spanned four identified industries. (See Table 17.)

**Table 17. ELSQ Industry Demographics, Response Rate (N=33)**
Because of the use of snowball sampling techniques, the number of companies included in the ELSQ Rev is not identified; however, 17 different industries were identified and 17 managers selected “other” as the industry category, which precludes specific identification. (See Table 18.)

Table 18. ELSQ Rev Industry Demographics Response Rate (N=106)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aerospace</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business support/logistics</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chemical Manufacturing</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Government</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Healthcare</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial manufacture</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marketing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mass communication</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Military</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Religious</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telcom</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With 17 specific industries identified in the ELSQ Rev population, compared to 4 specific industries in the ELSQ population, the ELSQ Rev includes a wider set of industries (325%), which may allow for broader applicability.
Country

For the ELSQ, all the respondents were from the United States. For the ELSQ Rev, 93.4% of the respondents were from the United States. Because the results of the non-U.S. respondents (style preference distribution of 3 duty, 2 virtue, and 2 justice) were not outliers compared to that of the U.S. respondents, the non-U.S. data was not excluded from this analysis. (See Table 19.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industry</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Argentina</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Germany</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>El Salvador</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guatemala</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mexico</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>United States</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>93.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With this population country distribution, the makeup remains a predominantly U.S. population.
Demographics summary
The study population demographics provide insight into how applicable any conclusions drawn from this sample about ethical leadership style might be to the general population of managers. Analysis of population segments is supported by the diversity of the population. Regarding gender, for instance, the population is roughly evenly split (55.7% female vs. 44.3% male). Despite some limitations, the demographic data reflects a relatively diverse population. This data will be further analyzed in the rest of the chapter to follow.

The ELSQ Rev population demographics can be compared to the ELSQ population demographics thusly:

- ELSQ Rev average age is 51.4 years (25.4% older).
- ELSQ Rev gender is 55.7% female (vs. 30% in ELSQ).
- ELSQ Rev education level is 66% graduate (42% higher).
- ELSQ Rev years of management experience is 14.4 years (30.1% higher).
- ELSQ Rev number of employees reporting is 76.5 employees (282% higher).

In summary, compared to the ELSQ population, the ELSQ Rev population is significantly higher in age, proportion female, graduate education, years of management experience, and number of reporting employees.

Statistics
The total selections for each style were tabulated, and frequency statistics were calculated in SPSS. In order to allow comparisons between different length surveys, the raw total of selections was divided by the number of sets of style combinations. This is done in the statistics herein and in the results presented on the website. Z skewedness and Z kurtosis statistics were added to the SPSS calculations in this analysis. These statistics are included in Appendix O.

The statistics show a spread of means from 1.044 to 3.623, reflecting a diversity of average style selections. If the 25 percentile and the 75 percentile cut-offs are considered low- and high-bound, each of the six styles can be associated with a meaningful interpretation of high or low. In this sense, each of the six styles shows diversity across the population.

Given general guidelines for interpretation of Z scores of a magnitude of 1.97 (Field, 2005, p. 41), the scores of the justice, duty, utility, and caring styles are normal in skew and kurtosis. While the virtue and egoism prompts do not show kurtosis, they do show skew. The virtue style shows a negative skew (or higher frequency of higher values) while the egoism prompt shows a positive skew (or lower frequency of lower values). The frequency plot of virtue is presented in the Figure 3:
Figure 3. Frequency Plot of Selections of the Virtue Style

The frequency plot of egoism is presented in Figure 4:
In interpretation of this skew, it is important to note that given the structure of the survey, it is not possible to have a result lower than zero or higher than 5. In these two frequency plots, the results for virtue can be seen to abruptly end at a maximum of 5, while the results for egoism abruptly end at zero.

**Correlations**

While the ELSQ used both Likert and percentage-based scales to measure the construct of ethical style, the ELSQ Rev uses only a forced-choice scale. If the styles
align as anticipated in the ELSQ Rev, then the ethical leadership constructs should have negative correlation, reflecting the forced nature of the selection. Ranging from 0 (representing no correlation) to 1 (representing perfect correlation), Pearson’s correlation is generally interpreted as strong when it is calculated at 0.70 or higher, weak when lower than 0.30, and moderate between these values. A value of 0.80 or higher is generally interpreted as very strong. Thus, significant Pearson correlations support both construct validity and reliability in the validation of the improved ELSQ. The Pearson correlations calculated by SPSS are shown in Appendix P.

As expected, the correlations are predominantly negative, reflecting the forced-choice nature of the survey. All of the significant correlations are negative. The ethical style of virtue is significantly negatively correlated at the 0.01 level with the ethical styles egoism (-0.511), duty (-0.394), and utility (-0.294). The ethical style of justice is significantly negatively correlated with egoism (-0.269, significant at the 0.01 level) and utility (-0.175, significant at the 0.05 level). The ethical style of duty is significantly negatively correlated at the 0.01 significance level with caring (-0.453) and virtue (-0.294). The ethical style of utility is significantly negatively correlated at the 0.01 level with caring (-0.385) and virtue (-0.294); and utility is negatively correlated at the 0.05 significance level with justice. The ethical style of caring is significantly negatively correlated at the 0.01 significance level with duty (-0.453) and utility (-0.385). The ethical style of egoism is significantly negatively correlated
at the 0.01 significance level with virtue (-0.511) and justice (-0.269). These
correlations are graphically represented in Figure 5:

![Graphical Representation of Correlations](image)

**Figure 5. Graphical Representation of Correlations**

This figure groups the styles by segmenting them into three categories. These
correlations can be used to suggest certain profiles. Virtue, justice, and duty have
proven to be the three main predominant styles. Based on the correlations present,
one might expect managers with virtue as their primary style to be low in egoism,
duty, and utility. By similar reasoning, managers with duty as their primary style may
be low in caring and virtue. Lastly, in this line of reasoning, managers with justice as
their primary style may be low in egoism and utility. This would be consistent with
this set of correlations with a set of three profiles. Alternatively, more than three
profiles may exist. For example, three profiles for virtue may exist: one low in duty,
one low in utility, and one low in egoism. This additional analysis is beyond the
scope of this research. This analysis has shown that the styles have a complex system
of interrelationship that may be a fruitful area for future research.
In the style arrangement in Figure 5 (above), the good was portrayed as separating itself from the other styles by virtue of its universal connotation. Caring and justice are perceived as more specific than the other styles. Duty was not considered as specific since, at least in the sense of prima facie duties, each role in a business situation (superior, subordinate, peer) will have a somewhat general set of prima facie duties. The diagram provided is one of many possible graphical layouts. It is included as one of many possible interpretations.

**Question Consistency**

Concern existed with the ELSQ that some of the vignettes might “pull” for a particular style in a way that distorted natural preferences. Because only five vignettes existed, limited data existed to evaluate any bias. With 45 questions in the ELSQ Rev, more data existed to remove any bias or inconsistency in the questions and thus improve validity and reliability. Using the preferences computed across all 45 questions, it is possible to compare each decision on each question and compare the selection taken to the one predicted, based on the style rankings across all questions. Cases where contrary predictions were made are considered inconsistencies or lack of fit with the model. Other vignettes are considered consistencies or fit with the model. Note that in the case of a comparison of two styles that have identical preference rating, the case is considered consistent. Question consistency is calculated in Table 20:
Table 20. Question Consistency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style A</th>
<th>Style B</th>
<th>Vignette Number</th>
<th>%Fit</th>
<th>Vignette Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Virtue</td>
<td>Distributive</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>81.10%</td>
<td>Sexting comment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>83.00%</td>
<td>Budget padding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtue</td>
<td>Distributive</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>84.90%</td>
<td>Snitch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>Duty</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>68.90%</td>
<td>Company processes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtue</td>
<td>Duty</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>84.00%</td>
<td>Difficult to work with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtue</td>
<td>Duty</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>81.10%</td>
<td>Discrimination charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtue</td>
<td>Utilitarianism</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>89.60%</td>
<td>Board member recruiting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtue</td>
<td>Utilitarianism</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>76.40%</td>
<td>Employee opportunity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtue</td>
<td>Utilitarianism</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>87.70%</td>
<td>Fixed price contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtue</td>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>81.10%</td>
<td>Helpful but behind</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtue</td>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>90.60%</td>
<td>Political contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtue</td>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>90.60%</td>
<td>Oil quality</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtue</td>
<td>Egoism</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>91.50%</td>
<td>False voucher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtue</td>
<td>Egoism</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>87.70%</td>
<td>False timesheet</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtue</td>
<td>Egoism</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>86.80%</td>
<td>Non-work chores</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive</td>
<td>Duty</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>73.60%</td>
<td>Quelling layoff rumors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>Duty</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>76.40%</td>
<td>CFO false rumors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive</td>
<td>Duty</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>86.80%</td>
<td>Resetting quota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style A</td>
<td>Style B</td>
<td>Vignette Number</td>
<td>%Fit</td>
<td>Vignette Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive</td>
<td>Utilitarianism</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>82.10%</td>
<td>Cosmetics objectifying</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive</td>
<td>Utilitarianism</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>88.70%</td>
<td>Business in foreign country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive</td>
<td>Utilitarianism</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>69.80%</td>
<td>Banned sleepwear</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>96.20%</td>
<td>Bonus allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive</td>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>83.00%</td>
<td>Plagiarism policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>Egoism</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>90.60%</td>
<td>Overworked team</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive</td>
<td>Egoism</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>91.50%</td>
<td>Fundraising report</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>Egoism</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>94.30%</td>
<td>Truck driver rest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duty</td>
<td>Utilitarianism</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>77.40%</td>
<td>3 candidates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duty</td>
<td>Utilitarianism</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>84.00%</td>
<td>Honoring Warranties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duty</td>
<td>Utilitarianism</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>71.70%</td>
<td>Stealing mother</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duty</td>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>58.50%</td>
<td>Layoff inform</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duty</td>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>79.20%</td>
<td>Passing on problem</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duty</td>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>84.90%</td>
<td>Security cameras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duty</td>
<td>Egoism</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>77.40%</td>
<td>Unfair criticism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duty</td>
<td>Egoism</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>70.80%</td>
<td>Keeping lower paid</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duty</td>
<td>Egoism</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>91.50%</td>
<td>CFO exaggeration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilitarianism</td>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>71.70%</td>
<td>Advertizing dinnerware</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilitarianism</td>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>84.00%</td>
<td>Different reviews submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilitarianism</td>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>74.50%</td>
<td>Hooky and employee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style A</td>
<td>Style B</td>
<td>Vignette Number</td>
<td>%Fit</td>
<td>Vignette Description</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilitarianism</td>
<td>Egoism</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>87.70%</td>
<td>Flying first class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilitarianism</td>
<td>Egoism</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>85.80%</td>
<td>Non-compete employee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilitarianism</td>
<td>Egoism</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>76.40%</td>
<td>Screening out older</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>Egoism</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>84.90%</td>
<td>Late mom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>Egoism</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>83.00%</td>
<td>False quality results</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Given the wide range of different vignettes and concerns presented in the ELSQ Rev, across the 45 vignettes, some variation was expected. On average, for the 45 questions, the consistency (fit) is 82.0%. As the survey has three sets of the 15 combinations, it is possible to compare the consistency across the three sets. Set 1 shows 80.8% consistency. Set 2 shows 83.0% consistency. Lastly, set 3 shows 82.1% consistency. This consistency across all three sets is an indicator of reliability and validity. Once individual questions are rated for consistency, it is possible to compute an optimally consistent subset of questions. In this case, a tie in consistency between question 25 (Political contributions) and question 31 (Oil quality) created two optimal sets with respect to consistency. Because of feedback from some individuals that they were concerned by question 31, question 25 is preferred and is included here and is referred to as ELSQ Rev (15-question), as outlined in Table 21.

Table 21. ELSQ Rev (15-question) Participant Employee Reports (N=106)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style A</th>
<th>Style B</th>
<th>Mismatch Percentage</th>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Question Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>Ego</td>
<td>84.9%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Late mom</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duty</td>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>84.9%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Security cameras</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duty</td>
<td>Ego</td>
<td>91.5%</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>CFO exaggeration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duty</td>
<td>Utilitarianism</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>Honoring Warranties</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive</td>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>96.2%</td>
<td>5 Bonus allocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive</td>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>Duty</td>
<td>86.8%</td>
<td>32 Resetting quota</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive</td>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>Ego</td>
<td>94.3%</td>
<td>33 Truck driver rest</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive</td>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>Utilitarianism</td>
<td>88.7%</td>
<td>26 Business in foreign country</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilitarianism</td>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>Different reviews submitted</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilitarianism</td>
<td>Ego</td>
<td>87.7%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Flying first class</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtue</td>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>90.6%</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>Political contributions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtue</td>
<td>Duty</td>
<td>84.0%</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>Difficult to work with</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtue</td>
<td>Ego</td>
<td>91.5%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>False voucher</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtue</td>
<td>Distributive Justice</td>
<td>84.9%</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Snitch</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtue</td>
<td>Utilitarianism</td>
<td>89.6%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Board member recruiting</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Whereas the 45 question ELSQ Rev has an average consistency of 82.0%, the ELSQ Rev (15-question) improves consistency to 88.2%. This additional consistency results from removing questions with lower consistency. For this reason, this selection increases validity and reliability of the ELSQ Rev (15-question) compared to the ELSQ Rev.
Result Matching

For validity and reliability, the results should match between the ELSQ Rev and the ELSQ Rev (15-question). Chikeleze (2014, p. 74) analyzed matches between the Likert and percentage-based sections of the ELSQ. In that analysis, Chikeleze reviewed perfect matches where the primary results were identical and imperfect matches where the result that one survey form showed primary was tied for primary in the other survey form. Chikeleze’s (2014) statistics on matches between the Likert and percentage-based scales is reproduced in Table 22 below:

Table 22. ELSQ Match Between Scales

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Perfect Match</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Match w/Tie</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duty</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtue</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>48%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>42%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>91%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Chikeleze, 2014, p. 67

Chikeleze (2014) found a 48% perfect match and a 42% imperfect match (match with tie) for a total 91% match. It is important to note that this comparison was with respect to using the exact same questions with different scales. The situation in comparing the ELSQ Rev and ELSQ Rev (15-question) is different in that this
analysis uses an overlapping set of the same questions with the same scale. For this reason, the results are not comparable. However, the technique of analyzing perfect and imperfect matches for a total match assessment is valid in both cases. Comparing matches between the ELSQ Rev and ELSQ Rev (15-question) results in the following matches, as outlined in Table 23:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Perfect</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Imperfect</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Virtue</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>39.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Justice</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21.7%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duty</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9.4%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tie2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>65</strong></td>
<td><strong>61.3%</strong></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25.5%</td>
<td><strong>92</strong></td>
<td><strong>86.8%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In this analysis, 86.8% of the results match with 61.3% perfect matches and 25.5% imperfect matches.

Because the ELSQ Rev (15-question) is a subset of the ELSQ Rev, the ELSQ Rev will provide more information than the ELSQ Rev (15-question). However, in the administration of the ELSQ Rev, numerous complaints were received about the time taken to complete the survey. While median times to complete the survey ranged from 20 to 25 minutes, many individuals took much more time. One individual, who admitted she “took her time” thinking through the vignettes, took over an hour to
complete the survey. Feedback from one individual was that “45 vignettes are a lot to ask someone to complete.” This comment led to suspicion that some individuals were starting but not completing the survey. To attempt to address this concern, a progress bar was added to the online survey. It is not known whether the progress bar encourages or discourages completion of the survey.

**Results and Demographics**

**Styles, age, and experience**
In an analysis of the ELSQ, Chikeleze (2014) found associations comparing age, years of management experience, and number of direct reports across ethical styles. These are outlined in Table 24:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Years Mgmt.</th>
<th>Employee Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duty</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtue</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Justice</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Match</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source: Chikeleze, 2014, p. 70*
For the sake of comparison, a similar analysis was done for the ELSQ Rev. The following statistics, outlined in Table 25, compare age, years of management experience, and number of direct reports across ethical styles:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Years Mgmt.</th>
<th>Employee Reports</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Virtue</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>42.5%</td>
<td>54.0</td>
<td>17.3</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28.3%</td>
<td>46.9</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duty</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17.0%</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.9%</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tie2</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>53.5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Treating the single manager displaying a primary preference for utility as an outlier, it is apparent that utility, caring, and egoism were not identified as significant primary styles. The same three styles that were identified as primary by Chikileze (2014) are identified here. However, while duty was the most prevalent of the three in the ELSQ, at 43%, it is the weakest of the three in the ELSQ Rev, at 17%. This may be due to a combination of factors, such as population differences and prompt changes. With a population three times larger, the ELSQ Rev may have better assessments of prompts with respect to its population demographics.
It is also apparent, as previously noted, that age, experience, and number of reports are higher in the ELSQ Rev population. In the ELSQ Rev results above (Table 25), the style of duty has the lowest average years of management experience. This may reflect that the style of duty is more prevalent among younger managers. If this is true, it would also explain why, with the younger ELSQ population, duty is the most popular style by a significant margin (22 percentage points); however, with the older ELSQ Rev population, virtue is the most popular style by a significant margin (24.1 percentage points). The changes in the prompts may also be responsible for some of this difference. The single manager displaying an ethical style of utility may be an outlier. In the ELSQ Rev, 11.3% of the managers did not have a single primary style, compared to 9% in the ELSQ, which is a roughly consistent result. The most striking difference across the styles, proportionally, is that the number of reports for the virtue style is 82.6% higher than the duty style; and similarly, the number of reports for the justice style is 111% higher than the duty style. These significant differences warrant additional investigation.

**Gender**

Chikeleze’s (2014) analysis of the ELSQ indicated some gender difference in style; however, the small sample size restricted the ability to generalize.
Table 26. ELSQ Styles and Gender (N=33)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Virtue</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duty</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>35%</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60%</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Match</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Source:* Adapted from Chikeleze, 2014, p. 71

In these ELSQ results, while preference for virtue seems roughly similar between genders, it is suggested that males prefer justice more than females (by 25 percentage points); and females prefer duty more than males (by 25 percentage points). However, the frequencies for styles involved in these comparisons are all 8 or below, so the sample size is very small. The results for the ELSQ Rev show a somewhat different pattern, as illustrated in Table 27:
Table 27. Styles and Gender (N=106)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Virtue</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>45%</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>42%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duty</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tie2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grand Total</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In these ELSQ Rev results, the preference for virtue seems roughly similar (within 4 percentage points) across genders, which is similar to the ELSQ results (which only varied by 2 percentage points). However, the preferences between genders for justice and duty styles have reversed. With the ELSQ Rev, it is suggested that females prefer justice more than males (by 13 percentage points—significant at 5%); and males prefer duty more than females (by 11 percentage points—significant at 17%). Given that the ELSQ Rev has a population over three times as large, the ELSQ Rev results may have more statistical weight. While this population is larger, the frequencies involved still only range between 7 and 24. The collection of additional data may clarify the existence and potential magnitude of gender preference, if such preference indeed exists.
Education
In Chikeleze’s (2014) analysis of ELSQ results, the sample size caused the maximum
frequency to be n=9. Duty, which was found to be the most prevalent style overall,
was found to be the most prevalent style for the college educated, which represented
21 of 33 respondents (63.6%), as can be seen in Table 28:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style</th>
<th>High School</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>College</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Graduate</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duty</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtue</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Match</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>24%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Chikeleze, 2014, p. 72

In the ELSQ Rev, the greater population increased the total data; however, the
increase of educational categories from three to six further segmented the data, as
illustrated in Table 29:
Table 29. Styles and Education (N=106)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Education Level</th>
<th>Virtue</th>
<th>Justice</th>
<th>Duty</th>
<th>Utility</th>
<th>Tie2</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>67%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>17%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Associate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachelor</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>32%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Master</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>36%</td>
<td>15%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doctorate</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>71%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>12%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>45</strong></td>
<td><strong>30</strong></td>
<td><strong>18</strong></td>
<td><strong>1</strong></td>
<td><strong>12</strong></td>
<td><strong>106</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Percentage</strong></td>
<td><strong>42%</strong></td>
<td><strong>28%</strong></td>
<td><strong>17%</strong></td>
<td><strong>1%</strong></td>
<td><strong>11%</strong></td>
<td><strong>100%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In the ELSQ Rev, the interplay of greater population and greater segmentation results in the sample maximum frequency being n=21. Virtue, which was found to be the most prevalent style overall, was found to be the most prevalent style for all segments with frequency greater than 4. From associate level on, the percentage assessed with virtue preference increases and the percentage with duty preference decreases. This result may be a fruitful area for future investigation.
Validity

Construct validity is defined as “the degree to which a test measures what it claims, or purports, to be measuring” (Cronbach & Meelh, 1955). In this context, the evaluation of ELSQ Rev construct validity assessed whether the ELSQ Rev actually measures the ethical leadership style construct as it purports. To provide a strong assessment of validity, typically, multiple independent measures of a common construct are used. While the population and prompts deployed in the ELSQ Rev are somewhat different, the same three main styles were identified in the ELSQ Rev as in the ELSQ, with only one outlier. This is a strong indicator of validity. Validity is also assessed using expert vetting that included 11 professors from multiple institutions, 11 senior business managers from 8 different industries, and 28 senior manager/doctoral candidates in leadership from two different CVDL cohorts (as reviewed in Chapter 3 Methods). The survey development process included integral involvement of the originator of the survey and the professor who reviewed the survey. In addition, question consistency of 82.0% across 45 very different vignettes, using identical prompts, also speaks to validity.

To specifically validate the construct of leadership, a review of the 45 vignettes by two senior managers with greater than 30 years of experience apiece was performed. These managers were part of the vetting process, and they were experts in the ethical style constructs. For this analysis, a taxonomy of leadership behaviors was needed, and for this, the Yukl, Gordon, and Taber taxonomy (2002) was selected because it
was designed to integrate the findings of 50 years of behavior research. Blind inter-rater reliability was found in 153 cases (93%), with 11 instances of disagreement (7%). After fewer than 15 minutes, the two raters reached total (100%) agreement.

The final ratings are illustrated in Table 30:

**Table 30. ELSQ Rev Situation Leadership Concept Validity Assessment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Yukl Leadership Dimension</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Short term planning</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitoring Operations &amp; Performance</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clarifying responsibility</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Task</strong></td>
<td><strong>61</strong></td>
<td><strong>37.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Supporting</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>10.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognizing</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consulting</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Empowering</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Relations</strong></td>
<td><strong>52</strong></td>
<td><strong>31.5%</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>External monitoring</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Envisioning change</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Encouraging innovative thinking</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taking personal risks</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Change</strong></td>
<td><strong>51</strong></td>
<td><strong>30.9%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In the assessment of the dimensions of leadership, in each situation, the minimum number of dimensions identified was 2, with a maximum of 8 dimensions and an average of 3.7 dimensions. This validated that each situation has multiple dimensions of leadership included. Reviewing the distribution of leadership dimensions identified, all of the dimensions identified by Yukl, Gordon, and Taber (2002) are found with a frequency of at least 5. By groupings, the review found 37.0% task oriented, 31.5% relations oriented, and 30.9% change related. In this way, a relative balance of leadership dimensions is found across Yukl, Gordon, and Taber’s (2002) categories of task, relations, and change. Thus the all the vignettes reflect multiple instances of the leadership construct in a distribution that is roughly balanced across Yukl, Gordon, and Taber’s (2002) styles. This gives strong indication of construct validity in the dimension of leadership.

For an assessment of the descriptions of the styles in the instructions, the same two senior managers reviewed the imperatives, describing the styles for association with the styles themselves. In the initial analysis total (100%) agreement was identified that the styles in question were identified in the prompts as associated. However, it was also found that in some occasions, a prompt identified for one style might be applicable for another style. For illustrative purposes, some discussion was around association of the imperative “Does meet his/her responsibilities” and the egoism style. It was suggested that it is generally in one’s interest to meet one’s responsibilities in any business environment, so that an association between this
imperative and this style existed. In this case, this association might be considered indirect through the mediating effect of the imperative to meet business responsibilities. In this way, there were many indirect associations between prompts and styles. This may be seen as a reflection of the conceptual overlap issues discussed in Chapter 5 Discussion. While this imperative overlap reflects indirect conceptual association, it does not imply the inability of the individual to distinguish the underlying concepts (or styles). In this example, responsibilities and self-interest are conceptually distinct; the example indicates they are associated by business practice. Because of these varied indirect associations, the initial blind inter-rater consistency was 77%. After over an hour of discussion, which included many distinctions and indirect associations, 100% agreement was reached. The final associations are outlined in Table 31:
Table 31. Style Prompt Construct Validity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Virtue Identified</th>
<th>Justice Identified</th>
<th>Duty Identified</th>
<th>Utility Identified</th>
<th>Caring Identified</th>
<th>Egoism Identified</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Virtue Prompts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice Prompts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duty Prompts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Prompts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring Prompts</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egoism Prompts</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In these results, perfect inclusion of the identified styles in the prompts used is reflected by the maximum value of three across the diagonal in the results. This reflects the associated style being perceived in each prompt or imperative. However, as discussed, many prompts could be associated (directly or indirectly) with other styles. This may be a statistical reflection of the overlap issue previously identified. Just as that overlap issue was primarily but not exclusively associated with virtue, the patterns of association indicated are strongest across the “virtue prompts” row and the “virtue identified” column. In this, it is important to remember that the core assessment in the virtue prompt is “good.” What this statistically implies may not be more than that minding justice, duty, the utility of all, and caring for close relationships is considered “good” in a way that egoism concern is not. If this is the
underlying dynamic, then this result further strengthens concerns regarding the social desirability bias regarding the egoism style. Social desirability, however, is a separate issue from construct validity; and in construct validity, the association of the styles with the prompts was 100%, which implies that the prompts are constructed to validly associate with the styles.

In summary, multiple indications of construct validity were provided, associated with the construction of the ELSQ Rev. Additionally, separate construct validity was done regarding the construct validity of the vignettes as relating to leadership (with 100% having 2 or more of Yukl, Gordon, and Taber’s [2002] leadership dimensions) and relating to styles (with 100% of the prompts being associated with the correct style). For these reasons, the ELSQ Rev displays construct validity in construction and with special relationship to the constructs of leadership (as constructed by Yukl, Gordon, & Taber, 2002) as well as the construct of styles (as herein constructed).

**Reliability**
Reliability assesses the ability of a measuring instrument to reproduce the same measures on different occasions with accuracy or consistency.

Since the purpose of the ELSQ is to provide a rank ordering of style preferences rather than to obtain a specific quantitative measure, reliability is not a key concern.
Typically, Cronbach’s alpha (Cronbach, 1951) is used in the measurement of internal consistency. Cronbach’s alpha varies from 0 to 1, with higher values indicating greater reliability and with an alpha coefficient of .70 or higher considered reliable (Nunnally, 1978). Cronbach’s alpha was calculated for the ELSQ by Chikeleze (2014, p. 62) with an overall alpha coefficient of .830 and individual alpha coefficients ranging from .704 to .920.

Unfortunately, given a two-option, forced-choice format, the computation of Cronbach’s alpha is not possible, as its calculation results in a negative covariance matrix (as confirmed using SPSS). Within the ELSQ Rev, however, it is possible to measure consistency across the three, 15-question sets of style parings included in the 45 questions. Given the wide range of different vignettes and concerns presented in the ELSQ Rev, across the 45 vignettes, some variation was expected. On average, for the 45 questions, the consistency (fit) is 82.0%. As the survey has three sets of the 15 combinations, it is possible to compare the consistency across the three sets. Set 1 shows 80.8% consistency. Set 2 shows 83.0% consistency. Lastly, set 3 shows 82.1% consistency. Each of these sets can be treated as independent measures on different occasions (different sets of questions). And these three independent evaluations vary by only 2.2%, which reflects a level of consistency. This consistency across all three sets is an indicator of reliability and validity.
The ELSQ identified a predominant leadership style in most of the managers. The highest scores on the two scales matched with 86.8% consistency. For these reasons, the ELSQ can be used to predict ethical leadership style.
Chapter 5: Discussion

Results in Relation the Leader Self Assessment

The lack of identification of instances of managers with predominant ethical styles of utilitarianism, caring, and egoism is consistent with previous research (Chikeleze, 2014). However, given that percentile breakouts identify variation across all of the styles, then manager’s scores on utilitarianism, caring, and egoism provide potentially useful information, even if that information does not represent a predominant disposition. For interpretations of ELSQ results that go beyond the predominant style, assessments of profiles across several styles may prove useful. Anecdotally, several individuals who took the survey did seem to be interested in their caring score, even though caring was not a predominant style for any managers.

In associating a philosophy with a style, it is not presumed that anyone with that style preference or anyone selecting that style prompt necessarily understands fully the philosophical underpinnings that such a style is built upon. For example, just because someone selects “I would do what a good person would do,” it is not presumed that such a manager is doing so with any understanding of Aristotelian philosophy. The selection of this general prompt might reflect an uncertainty of which principle to use but “a hopeful confidence in their own judgment” (M. J. Tracey, personal communication, April 30, 2016). This selection might represent a desire for more information or a reaction to the alternative prompt not fitting the situation well. For these reasons, while the ethical styles have sound philosophical underpinnings, those
who select those styles should not be presumed to necessarily be followers of the associated philosophies.

Based on the correlations, the ethical styles may significantly interact. Virtue is suggested be significantly correlated to duty, utility, and egoism at the 0.01 level; but not to caring or justice. Caring is suggested to be significantly correlated to duty and utility at the 0.01 level but not to the other styles. Justice is suggested to be significantly correlated at the 0.01 level, with egoism and with utility at the 0.05 level. These interactions bear additional analysis and interpretation.

The ELSQ Rev identifies predominant ethical styles for 88.7% of managers. This is consistent with Chikeleze (2014) and is a strong indication that most managers do have a predominant ethical leadership style in vignettes such at those included in the ELSQ and ELSQ Rev.

Using a larger population and a two-option, forced-choice structure, the ELSQ Rev is able to confirm the three styles previously found. Additionally, it was found that managers do vary in the strength of their preferences across all six styles, so metrics were provided so that managers can identify which quartile their preferences fall in with respect to each of the six styles. In addition, a shorter version, the ELSQ-5 is formulated that provides 86% consistency (matching) with the ELSQ-45, using only one-third the number of questions included in the ELSQ-45.
Statistical, construct, and reliability analyses were performed on the ELSQ Rev, which confirmed that the ELSQ Rev has construct validity, has content validity, and is a reliable instrument to assess ethical leadership style.

**Results in Relation to Moral Reasoning**
A number of questions related to moral reasoning apply in the conceptual framework of the ELSQ. These questions include: Are decisions made based on abstract principles or on the particulars of the situation? Is there one primary principle or are there many? Are these principles distinct or do they overlap? Are these principles natural among leaders or are they unnatural? The following sections will address these questions in order.

**Principles vs. particularism**
While the search for moral principles can be traced back to Socrates and Aristotle, the contrary concept that moral imperatives are purely embedded in the particulars of situations is of more modern popularity. Referred to by Rashdall as “unphilosophical intuitionism” (1907) and by Frankena as “act-deontology” (1963), it was more recently referred to as “ethical particularism” by Dancy (1983). Deontology refers to the study of duty. Dancy (1983) advanced act-deontology because of (in addition to other justifications) the difficulty with “the co-tenability of two principles which suggest conflicting answers in an awkward case” (1983, p. 532). In this case, a distinction is made between reasoning by “intuitive induction” (Dancy, 1983, p. 533)
from the particulars of a situation and “empirical generalization” from principles (Broad, 2014, p. 271). For Ross (1939), from these particulars, right principles can be recognized by induction rather than deduction:

Their rightness was not deduced from any general principle; rather the general principle was later recognized by intuitive inductions as being applied in the judgements already passed on particular acts (p. 170)

Rashdall (1907) also agrees on the existence of rules or principles, pointing to the moral instruction of children (p. 82–83). In contrast, while Dancy (1983) agrees on the particular acts, Dancy disagrees on the ability to generalize (1983, p. 542).

Contrary to this, criticism of principles in general, or of principles not derived from more foundational particulars, many philosophical views see these principles as foundational:

The various forms of deontology and consequentialism are foundationalist theories. They are foundationalist in the sense that they both offer differing views on what the most fundamental moral principles are and they maintain that all our obligations can be derived from those principles (Stratton-Lake, 2012, p. 364).

These contrasting views reflect disagreement over the fundamental question, as synthesized by M. Tracey: “Does valid moral reasoning require the consistent application of principles to diverse moral problems, or is valid moral reasoning situation specific?” (personal communication, January 14, 2016). This will impact the discussion to follow on ethical styles, since if moral reasoning is particular, an
individual may decide one situation based on one style (or set of principles) and another on a different style (or set of principles).

The tension between principles and particulars addresses the extent to which moral reasoning is based on the situation and cannot be abstracted into principles. As the ELSQ Rev contains vignettes with particulars and prompts based on principles, this principle has an analogy in consideration of the interplay between the vignettes and prompts in the ELSQ Rev. If the 45 vignettes presented are reasonable moral contexts, then the interplay of the particular and the principle can be associated with the ability to identify principles consistently in the vignettes. In the statistical analysis presented, this might be related to question consistency. Question consistency averaged 82%, which indicates a high level of ability to match the style principles to the 45 vignettes presented. That this falls short of 100% may suggest that there does appear to be some particular source of inconsistency. One question did exhibit only 58% consistency. While these principles may be consistently applied in 82% of vignettes, whether they originate as principles or from the particulars of the situation is not indicated here by their existence. As moral vignettes, the 45 vignettes included do not have the complexity and nuance of real situations, which may make this comparison invalid.
Monism vs. pluralism

If principles exist in moral reasoning, then it might naturally be inquired as to whether they are singular or plural. Moral theorists have diverged on this point. For example, the monist heritage of utilitarianism has been contrasted with the pluralism of intuitionism (Dancy, 1983, p. 531).

Some moral philosophers have criticized the possibility of a pluralism of principles. Dancy’s (1983) difficulty with “the co-tenability of two principles which suggest conflicting answers in an awkward case” (p. 532) has been previously touched upon. Other philosophers have suggested that a plurality of prima facie duties is “the best form of deontology” (Stratton-Lake, 2012, p. 364). Ross (1939) in particular identifies a plurality of prima facie duties including non-maleficence, obeying the law, beneficence, self improvement, reparation, and gratitude (pp. 25–28). This plurality of reasons has been referred to as “prime facie pluralism” by Dancy (1983, p. 535).

These contrasting views reflect disagreement over the fundamental question, as synthesized by M. Tracey: “Is valid moral reasoning a deduction from one overarching principle (e.g., self-interest, self-actualization, maximal net utility, just distribution), or might there instead be an irreducible plurality of equally basic and incommensurable moral principles?” (personal communication, January 14, 2016). This will impact the discussion to follow on the distribution of ethical styles. If
principles are singular, it might be expected that only one style will be identified, or at least only one main style per person.

The tension between monism and pluralism addresses the number of fundamental moral principles. The ELSQ presents six basic principles that are constructed as styles. Within the context of these six principles, it is found that for 88.7% of managers one out of three basic styles is primary. In this way, for 88.7% of managers there seems to be a primary principle; however, managers differ across three options as to what a primary principle is. For 30% of those with a predominant style, that style exceeds the secondary style by 1 1/3 points or more. This might be categorized as a strong preference. In this way, a predominant and often strong predominant style often exists for an individual. However, dominance is different from monism, so this comparison is not equivocal. It should also be noted that the six principles included do not cover all possibilities, so another principle that supersedes these six may exist. In this way, the styles offered may not be truly reflective of moral reasoning.

**Distinctiveness vs. overlap**

One difficulty in comparing different moral principles is that the concepts themselves may not be clearly distinguished. In one context, egotistical selfishness may be considered clearly distinguished from care for others; however, this is not true for Aristotle. For Aristotle (350 B.C./1966), friendship is recognition of the other as “another self” (IX.8), and so care for self and other overlap. The virtue of justice may
conceptually overlap with a style of distributive justice. The virtue of prudence may conceptually overlap with the style of utilitarianism. Regarding the styles of virtue, utilitarianism, and egoism, as M. Tracey points out, “what is best for all may also be what is in the agent’s self interest, and this may also happen to be what contributes to the agent’s self-actualization” (personal communication, January 14, 2016). These overlaps may affect decisions comparing styles.

The tension between distinction and overlap in principles addresses whether the principles are conceptually distinguished. The discussion of style prompt construct validity in Chapter 4 Results identifies that there is overlap in the conceptual application of prompts to vignettes. However, the overlap of applicability does not preclude the ability to distinguish the principles in question. For instance, helping a coworker may be considered both the caring and the virtuous act to perform. However, it may be possible to distinguish whether the motivation for helping is based more on concern for relationship or more on acting with virtuous character. Distinguishing these two concerns is in fact what the questions in the ELSQ Rev do—and the results of this research demonstrated that managers are able to distinguish such concerns with consistent preferences. For this reason, the existence of overlap does not preclude proper operation of the survey as designed.
Naturalness vs. unnaturalness

If principle preferences can be found and distinguished among leaders in some determinant proportion, the question can be raised as to whether they are natural or not. For instance, the work of Gilligan (1977, 1982) might suggest that the caring style will be preferred more by women. Also, it might be expected that styles related to virtue and deontology may be related to education level “because they represent the fruit of expert philosophical reflection [and so] do not occur to leaders untutored in moral philosophy” (M. Tracey, personal communication, January 14, 2016). By capturing gender and education in survey demographic information, such questions may potentially be investigated. In fact, caring and virtue did not vary based on gender. Styles also did not significantly vary based on education. However, gender differences in duty and justice reversed between the ELSQ and ELSQ Rev. The ELSQ Rev shows that women show a preference for justice that is significant at the 5% level, and at least for senior managers in the U.S., there is some evidence of a gender variance in style. What this represents bears future investigation. It does appear to be a difference that naturally appears at least within the ELSQ Rev survey population. In this way, it might be said to be natural.
Chapter 6: Implications for Future Research

*Implications for Ethical Style Self Assessment*

Based on the results of this research, a number of recommendations for future research have been identified.

The additional demographic data has both given insight and suggested new analysis that only additional demographic data can address. More demographic variables might be added. With a much larger population, sufficient data might be available to identify gender and educational impacts where existing results show that a significant trend may exist. Different industries might display different characteristics. In particular, cross-cultural demographics may allow some assessment of whether certain patterns of style preferences are cultural or appear to be natural. A larger survey population has the potential to identify patterns that are not evident in the current data set.

The set of styles included might be added to or subtracted from. For the existing styles, if they were retained, the style prompts could be adjusted. New prompts for virtue and for egoism that do not potentially suffer from social desirability bias or conceptual overlap could be developed. The vignettes might be refined.

The online survey site might be enhanced to offer an option to take either the ELSQ Rev (15-question) or the ELSQ Rev. Additionally, based on the guidelines computed
herein, feedback could be immediately given on all six metrics, comparing an individual’s results to the averages for all managers. Or, the immediate results might be screened and the manager compared to other managers with the same primary style. An option for the respondent to provide emails identifying other managers who might potentially benefit from taking the ELSQ Rev could be added. The content of the results section could be enhanced.

Structurally, the forced-choice formulation that offers three options for each situation and the modified Likert based reformulations of the ELSQ still remain potentially fruitful options. The structure of the ELSQ Rev suggests opportunities for qualitative or less structured research. For instance, in the development of questions for the ELSQ Rev, the vignettes were presented to some managers, and they were allowed to share their reactions to the situation without having any questions proposed. Such research might provide new insight into ethical leadership decision-making. Research could identify leaders with different primary ethical styles and do a comparative case study on perhaps one manager with each of the three identified primary styles.

In the initial versions of the reformulation of the ELSQ, a small number of individuals were identified as having predominant styles of utilitarianism, caring, and egoism. In later surveys, as additional emphasis was placed on dimensions of ethics and leadership, these same individuals no longer had those predominant styles but rather moved to the three main styles identified. It may be that if the dimensions of
ethics and leadership were deemphasized, then individuals may identify themselves with the utilitarian, caring, and egoism styles. Such a survey may be distinguished as more “business” than “ethics” and more “decision-making” than “leadership” and so might be more aptly characterized as a “Business Decision-Making Style Questionnaire” rather than an ELSQ. Alternatively, private life rather than business could be the setting for the vignettes. Such an instrument might investigate whether ethical issues and leadership responsibilities cause leaders to act differently than they naturally would act in other vignettes. This might give insight into the burdens of leadership.

Research might investigate the origins and stability of style preferences. Such research might raise a number of valuable issues: Are a child’s preferences related to his or her parents? If so, are the preferences related to both equally, independent of the gender of parent and child? Does such preference remain stable over life? Do the preferences of superiors affect their subordinates?

The ELSQ conceptual framework terminates with the identification of the predominant style. The specifics of operationalizing that style are not addressed. For instance, in discussing the bonus allocation vignette with three respondents who both felt the preferred style was being “fair,” one was concerned with being fair to the most productive employees, one was concerned with being fair to all the employees, and another was concerned with being fair to the company. In this way, the same
style was operationalized in very different ways to different actions. It was also noted that two managers shared that they would take the same action—namely give the bonus to the peak performers; yet one chose this action out of a desire to be fair and the other chose this action as doing their duty. In this way, the same action may be motivated by different styles. Thus the relationship between styles and operationalized style-motivated actions is not a simple one-to-one correspondence (at least not in all cases). The topic of style operationalization is left to future research. This operationalization is a key link in resolving the situational dilemmas into an ethical action (R. Woodman, personal communication, April 1, 2016).

The ELSQ Theoretical Framework as a Leader Assessment Instrument
Existing leader assessment instruments will be briefly mentioned, followed by a discussion of the potential for an ELSQ-based leader assessment instrument. A full, detailed review of the existing leader assessment instruments is beyond the scope of this research.

Existing leader assessment instruments
A number of ethical measurement instruments have been developed.

Craig and Gustafson’s Perceived Leader Integrity Scale (PLIS)
The PLIS was developed to investigate leaders’ integrity and effectiveness (Craig & Gustafson, 1998) and to encourage the development of empirical data on ethical leadership. Based on populations of undergraduate students (78) and college
employees (299), the PLIS uses 77 questions to measure whether followers consider
the leader to have integrity. Dimensions of the PLIS include measures to determine
the following: if the leader is a hypocrite, is vindictive, takes credit due to others, and
is evil. The authors suggest use of the PLIS in conjunction with measuring
organizational culture, leader feedback, or leader assessment.

Brown, Trevino, and Harrison’s Ethical Leadership Scale (ELS)
The ELS (Brown, Trevino, & Harrison, 2005) used a literature analysis to identify 48
elements of ethical leadership and then used MBA candidate interviews to distill a
ten-item questionnaire. Ethical leadership was defined as “the demonstration of
normatively appropriate conduct through personal actions and interpersonal
relationships, and the promotion of such conduct to followers through two-way
communication, reinforcement, and decision-making (Brown, Trevino, & Harrison,
2005, p. 120). Using social learning theory, this definition incorporates the necessity
that leaders both demonstrate (role model) and promote ethical behavior.

Riggio, Zhu, and Reina’s Leadership Virtues Questionnaire (LVQ)
Using the classical construct for “leader” led Riggio, Zhu, & Reina (2010) to define
an ethical leader as one “whose personal characteristics and actions align with … the
cardinal virtues of prudence, fortitude, temperance, and justice” (p. 239). Using this
definition, they developed a 36-question Leadership Virtues Questionnaire and
applied it in concert with positive leadership measures. Transformational, ethical, and
authentic leadership were found to be positively correlated with ethical leadership.
Kalshoven, Den Hartog, and De Hoogh’s Ethical Leadership Work Questionnaire (ELWQ)

Defining seven ethical leader behaviors, Kalshoven, Den Hartog, & De Hoogh (2011) developed a 46-item measurement instrument. Application of the ELWQ showed that it was positively related to satisfaction, commitment, and organizational citizenship behavior and negatively related to cynicism.

Yukl, Mahsud, Hassan, and Prussia’s Ethical Leadership Questionnaire (ELQ)

Yukl, Mahsud, Hassan, & Prussia (2013) reviewed ethics literature and created an ELQ with 15 items. The ELQ was tested using 192 full-time MBA students who used the ELQ to measure their current supervisor. Use of the ELQ was shown to improve leader effectiveness.

The Potential for an ELSQ-based leader assessment instrument

While a number of leader assessments exist, they simply consolidate the feedback from third parties for the leader’s assessment. If an internal assessment of ethical leadership style could be made using the ELSQ Rev, and an external assessment of whether followers perceive these styles in action could be made, then a comparison of the two could yield valuable information. Comparing these two results might allow leaders to know if they are actually externally perceived as acting consistent with the way the leader perceives that they do in fact act. This could clear up misunderstandings between leaders and followers. In particular, in the area of egoism, it would be of interest to see if a leader’s perspective of the role of egoism in affecting their actions is consistent with the follower’s perspective.
Summary
Strong philosophical foundations for each of the ethical leadership styles are identified. Support for a style of virtue exists in the work of Aristotle (350 B.C./1966), Kant (1977), Locke (1975), Plato (1925/1990c), and Peterson and Seligman (2004). Support for a style of distributive justice exists in the work of Kohlberg (1981), Plato (1925/1990c), and Rawls (1971). Support for a style of duty exists in the work of Kant (2012) and Ross (2002). Support for a style of utilitarianism exists in the work of Bentham (1789/2009), Hume (1739/2010b, 1751/2010a), and Mill (1861/1998). Support for a style of caring exists in works associated with feminism (Gilligan, 1977; Nunner-Winkler, 1993; Tronto, 2005), altruism (Comte, 1973), moral sentiments (Smith, 2010), and relationships (Bowers & Seashore, 1966; Stogdill, 1974). Support for a style of egoism exists in the works of Aristotle (350 B.C./1966), Kant (1977), Rachels (2008), Rand (1957), Ross, (1939), and Sedgwick (1907). Thus all of the styles have a solid philosophical foundation. This, of course, is not to imply that anyone who selects a particular prompt is aware of or ascribes to all the supporting philosophical theories.

The methodology used is one that I call collaborative instrument development. This methodology is inspired by, but not identical to, the other iterative methods (Sackman, 1974). Additional components drawn from other research methodologies (Grant & Davis, 1997) are included in collaborative instrument development. This
methodology is an iterative one that draws on multiple expert panels as well as the researcher. The experts in this research include an academic set of 11 professors, a senior business set of 11 managers across 8 industries with over 267 years of experience, and a senior manager/doctoral candidate set that included 28 managers. This process operated through 10 cycles, collecting 279 potential vignettes, evaluating 33 survey versions, evaluating 44 prompt versions, and settling on a final version. Extensive changes were made in the survey in terms of vignettes used, demographics collected, structure (two-alternative, forced-choice format), and delivery method (online). In order to assess validity and reliability, three additional surveys were completed: a word association assessment, a leadership concept assessment, and a prompt style assessment.

The survey was administered online from March 3, 2016, to March 31, 2016, collecting 106 usable surveys. The ELSQ Rev population demographics varied compared to the ELSQ population demographics:

- ELSQ Rev average age is 51.4 years (25.4% older).
- ELSQ Rev gender is 55.7% female (vs. 30% in ELSQ).
- ELSQ Rev education level is 66% graduate (42% higher).
- ELSQ Rev average years of management experience is 14.4 years (30.1% higher).
- ELSQ Rev average number of employees reporting is 76.5 employees (282% higher).
The ELSQ identified a predominant leadership style in 88.7% of the managers. The ELSQ Rev confirmed the existence of the same three primary styles as the ELSQ. To some degree, all of the six style preferences did vary across managers, such that the ELSQ Rev does provide managers with meaningful results for being high (75th percentile) or low (25th percentile) for each of the six style scores compared to other managers.

While most of the style results fit a normal distribution, negative skew was observed in the virtue style variable and positive skew was observed in the egoism style variable. A complex set of correlations between the style variables exists. Females exhibited a higher level of the justice ethical style at a 0.05 significance level. The high level of question consistency (82.0%) supports the validity and reliability of the instrument. This consistency also allows a shorter, 15-question version of the ELSQ Rev to have high consistency with the 45-question version (86.8% consistency). In these ways, the two-alternative, forced-choice version of the ELSQ did demonstrate consistency, validity, and reliability in identifying predominant ethical leadership styles. By demonstrating this based on 45 vignettes rather than the 5 vignettes in the ELSQ, the ELSQ Rev demonstrates validity over a much larger range of vignettes.

It is hoped that the results of this research may encourage additional research in the area of ethical leadership style. This research could be quantitative or qualitative. And this research could investigate further aspects of leader self-assessment, or it could
investigate leader assessment by those with whom the leaders interact. The focus could stay on leader business ethics, or broaden. A variety of demographic and conceptual opportunities for additional research have been identified. Of particular interest might be further evaluation of any gender differences in preferences for the distributive justice and duty ethical styles. These varied opportunities reflect a wide range of potential future contributions in the area of leadership ethics.
Appendix A: Original Ethical Leadership Style Questionnaire

As a participant in this study, you will be asked to complete two versions of the Ethical Leadership Style Questionnaire. It will take approximately 25 minutes to complete the questionnaire. Your replies will be completely anonymous, so do not put your name anywhere on the form.

Please begin by responding to the following demographic questions:

Demographic information:
1. Age in years: ______________
2. Gender: __________
3. Level of Education: h.s. _________ college _________ graduate _________
4. Number of years in management: __________
5. Number of employees who report to you: __________

After filling out the demographic information, please proceed to the next page and begin answering Form A of the questionnaire.
Form A
Instructions
Consider the following five situations. For each situation, place yourself in the role of the leader or manager and then think about how you would respond to the situation. Indicate the relative weight you would give to each of the 6 response choices. Do so by writing a percentage next to each response choice such that the higher percentages mean you would place more weight on that response in your decision. You may use any percentages from 0% to 100% but your responses across all the choices must sum to 100%.

Situation 1
You are the supervisor in a mid-sized company of an advertising department, which is comprised of 10 people. In your department, a subordinate appears to have a problem with alcohol. Several work groups have noticed it and have commented. The subordinate occasionally calls in sick, has demonstrated attributes of a hangover, and has been seen drinking at lunch.
In this situation, I would be concerned about….
1. …making sure that more people benefited by the outcome, than were hurt by it. _____
2. …determining how this situation could affect my close work relationships. __________
3. …making sure my own goals as leader are satisfied. ____________
4. …fulfilling my obligations as the leader-in-charge. ___________
5. …treating everyone fairly. __________
6. …doing what an exemplary leader would do in the situation. ______
Total 100%
Please comment:
7. What other ethical issues or concerns might you have about this situation that are not covered in the above response choices.

_______________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________
_______________________________________________________________
Situation 2
You have been selected to lead a team whose mission is to improve work processes in the organization. The team’s assignment is to deliver a list of recommended work process changes (e.g., reducing paperwork, improving communication, or eliminating unneeded steps in processes) that will help the organization work more efficiently and effectively. The team consists of eight people, each representing an operational or staff function in the organization. They are at different levels and represent a wide range of interests, technical specialties, and personalities. Upper management is expecting great things from this group.
In this situation, I would be concerned about…
1. …making sure that more people benefited by the outcome than were hurt by it. ______
2. …doing what an exemplary leader would do in the situation. _______
3. …making sure my own goals as leader are satisfied. __________
4. …determining how this situation could affect my close work relationships. __________
5. …treating everyone fairly. ______
6. …fulfilling my obligations as the leader-in-charge. __________
Total 100%
Please comment:
7. What other ethical issues or concerns might you have about this situation that are not covered in the above response choices.

______________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________
Situation 3
You have been selected to lead a team investigating possible sexual harassment in two departments of the organization. Formal complaints have not yet been filed, but there have been informal messages to upper management. In addition, the turnover of women employees in the two departments is much higher than in other departments and exit interviews tend to indicate sexual harassment issues. The team consists of a representative from Human Resources, the organization’s attorney, and a male and female employee from each department in the company.

In this situation, I would be concerned about…
1. …fulfilling my obligations as the leader-in-charge. __________
2. …treating everyone fairly. ________
3. …making sure my own goals as leader are satisfied. __________
4. …determining how this situation could affect my close work relationships.
   ________
5. …doing what an exemplary leader would do in the situation. ______
6. …making sure that more people benefited by the outcome than were hurt by it.____

Total 100 points
Please comment:
7. What other ethical issues or concerns might you have about this situation that are NOT covered in the above response choices.

_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
_________________________________________________________________________
Situation 4
Your work group has been awarded a large performance bonus by upper management. Members of the group know about the award and its amount. There has been discussion about how you will divide up the money. Some are arguing that every member of the team should get a one-time three-percent of annual pay bonus. Others are arguing that the highest performing persons in the group should be given an additional bonus. You are sensitive to these arguments.
In this situation, I would be concerned about….
1. …treating everyone fairly. ______
2. …making sure my own goals as leader are satisfied. __________
3. …doing what an exemplary leader would do in the situation. ______
4. …determining how this situation could affect my close work relationships.
   __________
5. …making sure that more people benefited by the outcome than were hurt by it. _____
6. …fulfilling my obligations as the leader-in-charge. __________
Total 100%
Please comment:
7. What other ethical issues or concerns might you have about this situation that are NOT covered in the above response choices.
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
   ________________________________________________________________
Situation 5
You are a senior director of a 15-member work team at a small manufacturing company. One of your work group members is a single mother. She has a problem child. She takes time off of work to deal with the child. Team members are beginning to resent her absences and lack of contribution.
In this situation, I would be concerned about….
1. … determining how this situation could affect my close work relationships.

2. … treating everyone fairly.
3. … making sure my own goals as leader are satisfied.
4. … making sure that more people benefited by the outcome, than were hurt by it.
5. … doing what an exemplary leader would do in the situation.
6. … fulfilling my obligations as the leader-in-charge.
Total 100%
Please comment:
7. What other ethical issues or concerns might you have about this situation that are not covered in the above response choices.
Form B
Instructions
Consider the following five situations. For each situation, place yourself in the role of the leader or manager and then think about how you would respond to the situation. Indicate your response to each of the six response choices by circling one of the five numbers to the right of each choice.

Situation 1
You are the supervisor in a mid-sized company of an advertising department, which is comprised of 10 people. In your department, a subordinate appears to have a problem with alcohol. Several work groups have noticed it and have commented. The subordinate occasionally calls in sick, has demonstrated attributes of a hangover, and has been seen drinking at lunch.

Key
1 = Strongly Disagree 2 = Disagree 3 = Neutral 4 = Agree 5 = Strongly Agree

In this situation, I would be concerned about….
1. …fulfilling my obligations as the leader-in-charge. 1 2 3 4 5
2. …doing what an exemplary leader would do in the situation. 1 2 3 4 5
3. …making sure my own goals as leader are satisfied. 1 2 3 4 5
4. …determining how this situation could affect my close work relationships. 1 2 3 4 5
5. …treating everyone fairly. 1 2 3 4 5
6. …making sure that more people benefited by the outcome than were hurt by it. 1 2 3 4 5
Situation 2
You have been selected to lead a team whose mission is to improve work processes in the organization. The team’s assignment is to deliver a list of recommended work process changes (e.g., reducing paperwork, improving communication, or eliminating unneeded steps in processes) that will help the organization work more efficiently and effectively. The team consists of eight people, each representing an operational or staff function in the organization. They are at different levels and represent a wide range of interests, technical specialties, and personalities. Upper management is expecting great things from this group.

Key
1 = Strongly Disagree 2 = Disagree 3 = Neutral 4 = Agree 5 = Strongly Agree

In this situation, I would be concerned about….
1. …making sure that more people benefited by the outcome than were hurt by it. 1 2 3 4 5
2. …making sure my own goals as leader are satisfied. 1 2 3 4 5
3. …doing what an exemplary leader would do in the situation. 1 2 3 4 5
4. …treating everyone fairly. 1 2 3 4 5
5. …determining how this situation could affect my close work relationships. 1 2 3 4 5
6. …fulfilling my obligations as the leader-in-charge. 1 2 3 4 5
Situation 3
You have been selected to lead a team investigating possible sexual harassment in two departments of the organization. Formal complaints have not yet been filed, but there have been informal messages to upper management. In addition, the turnover of women employees in the two departments is much higher than in other departments and an exit interviews tends to indicate sexual harassment issues. The team consists of a representative from Human Resources, the organization’s attorney, and a male and female employee from each department in the company.

Key
1 = Strongly Disagree 2 = Disagree 3 = Neutral 4 = Agree 5 = Strongly Agree

In this situation, I would be concerned about….

1. …doing what an exemplary leader would do in the situation. 1 2 3 4 5
2. …making sure that more people benefited by the outcome than were hurt by it. 1 2 3 4 5
3. …fulfilling my obligations as the leader-in-charge. 1 2 3 4 5
4. …determining how this situation could affect my close work relationships. 1 2 3 4 5
5. …treating everyone fairly. 1 2 3 4 5
6. …making sure my own goals as leader are satisfied. 1 2 3 4 5
Situation 4
Your work group has been awarded a large performance bonus by upper management. Members of the group know about the award and its amount. There has been discussion about how you will divide up the money. Some are arguing that every member of the team should get a one-time three-percent of annual pay bonus. Others are arguing that the highest performing persons in the group should be given an additional bonus. You are sensitive to these arguments.

Key
1 = Strongly Disagree 2 = Disagree 3 = Neutral 4 = Agree 5 = Strongly Agree

In this situation, I would be concerned about….

1. …determining how this situation could affect my close work relationships. 1 2 3 4 5
2. …making sure that more people benefited by the outcome than were hurt by it. 1 2 3 4 5
3. …fulfilling my obligations as the leader-in-charge. 1 2 3 4 5
4. …doing what an exemplary leader would do in the situation. 1 2 3 4 5
5. …treating everyone fairly. 1 2 3 4 5
6. …making sure my own goals as leader are satisfied. 1 2 3 4 5
Situation 5
You are a senior director of a 15-member work team at a small manufacturing company. One of your work group members is a single mother. She has a problem child. She takes time off of work to deal with the child. Team members are beginning to resent her absences and lack of contribution.

Key
1 = Strongly Disagree 2 = Disagree 3 = Neutral 4 = Agree 5 = Strongly Agree

In this situation, I would be concerned about . . .
1. …doing what an exemplary leader would do in the situation. 1 2 3 4 5
2. …fulfilling my obligations as the leader-in-charge. 1 2 3 4 5
3. …treating everyone fairly. 1 2 3 4 5
4. …making sure my own goals as leader are satisfied. 1 2 3 4 5
5. …making sure that more people benefited by the outcome than were hurt by it. 1 2 3 4 5
6. …determining how this situation could affect my close work relationships. 1 2 3 4 5
Appendix B: Ethical Leadership Style Questionnaire Version 2.0

Instructions
Consider the following five situations. For each situation, place yourself in the role of the leader or manager and then think about how you would respond to the situation. Indicate your response to each of the six response choices by circling one of the five numbers to the right of each choice.

[A number of options to attempt to reconfigure the survey instrument to find all 6 Ethical Styles – that is to also find egoism, caring, and utilitarianism:]

Situation 1
You are the supervisor in a mid-sized company of an advertising department, which is comprised of 10 people. With children in college, you badly need this job but fear your job is in jeopardy because of problems with disruptions and low productivity in the department. In your department, a very productive, very well-liked subordinate appears to have a serious problem with alcohol. The subordinate occasionally calls in sick, has demonstrated attributes of a hangover, and has been seen drinking at lunch. While in general the subordinate has strong, warm relationships with those in the group, several work groups have noticed it and have commented or complained.

Key
1 = Strongly Disagree 2 = Disagree 3 = Neutral 4 = Agree 5 = Strongly Agree

In this situation, I would be concerned about….
1. …doing what an exemplary leader would do in the situation. 1 2 3 4 5
2. …fulfilling my obligations as the leader-in-charge. 1 2 3 4 5
3. …treating everyone fairly. 1 2 3 4 5
4. …brings success in my mission. 1 2 3 4 5
5. …does the greatest good for the greatest number. 1 2 3 4 5
6. …builds good relationships. 1 2 3 4 5
Situation 2

Highlighting egoism, caring, and utilitarianism

You are a new manager in a large clothing company that sells over the internet. Sales have been growing quickly which has caused a lot of problems and bottlenecks. Many of the groups have had to work extended shifts including weekends and are exhausted. They look to you as their trusted advocate to help them. You have been selected to lead a team whose mission is to improve work processes in the organization. The team’s assignment is to deliver a list of recommended work process changes (e.g., reducing paperwork, improving communication, or eliminating unneeded steps in processes) that will help the organization work more efficiently and effectively. The team consists of eight people, each representing an operational or staff function in the organization. They are at different levels and represent a wide range of interests, technical specialties, and personalities. While previous efforts to improve processes have been a failure, you have been positioned as the ‘new blood’ who will solve the problem. Upper management is expecting great things from this group and from you in particular.

In this situation, I would be concerned about….
1. …doing what an exemplary leader would do in the situation. 1 2 3 4 5
2. …fulfilling my obligations as the leader-in-charge. 1 2 3 4 5
3. …treating everyone fairly. 1 2 3 4 5
4. … brings success in my mission. 1 2 3 4 5
5. … does the greatest good for the greatest number. 1 2 3 4 5
6. … builds good relationships. 1 2 3 4 5
Situation 3

Highlighting egoism, caring, and utilitarianism

You have been called in on the weekend to lead a high-profile team investigating possible sexual harassment in two departments of the organization you manage. Formal complaints have not yet been filed, but there have been informal messages to upper management. In addition, the turnover of women employees in the two departments is much higher than in other departments and exit interviews tend to indicate sexual harassment issues that numerous women have suffered for several years including some good personal friend of yours. Not only have highly talented women left the organization, talented women appear to be avoiding entering the organization. The team consists of a representative from Human Resources, the organization’s attorney, and a male and female employee from each department in the company. Your executive team is very concerned and is holding you accountable to resolve the situation with professionalism and without disruption.

In this situation, I would be concerned about….
1. …doing what an exemplary leader would do in the situation. 1 2 3 4 5
2. …fulfilling my obligations as the leader-in-charge. 1 2 3 4 5
3. …treating everyone fairly. 1 2 3 4 5
4. …brings success in my mission. 1 2 3 4 5
5. …does the greatest good for the greatest number. 1 2 3 4 5
6. …builds good relationships. 1 2 3 4 5
Situation 4

Highlighting egoism, caring, and utilitarianism

You manage a group of 12 salespeople in a small equipment manufacturing company. Because of the company’s strong performance, your work group has been awarded a large performance bonus by upper management. Members of the group know about the award and its amount. There has been discussion about how you will divide up the money. Some are arguing that every member of the team should get a one-time three-percent of annual pay bonus. Others are arguing that the highest performing persons in the group should be given a higher bonus. You know that certain group members have financial difficulties. You also know that your top performers feel underappreciated and are vocal about it. You do not want to discourage your highest performers nor do you want to discourage the rest of the employees. You are sensitive to these all arguments. However, you are also concerned that any treatment that some people feel was unfair will cause internal disagreements to erupt and cause productivity to be damaged long run. You know that upper management is very focused on productivity; and any dip in productivity in your group will have severe repercussion for you.

In this situation, I would be concerned about….
1. …doing what an exemplary leader would do in the situation. 1 2 3 4 5
2. …fulfilling my obligations as the leader-in-charge. 1 2 3 4 5
3. …treatting everyone fairly. 1 2 3 4 5
4. … brings success in my mission. 1 2 3 4 5
5. … does the greatest good for the greatest number. 1 2 3 4 5
6. … builds good relationships. 1 2 3 4 5
Situation 5

Highlighting egoism, caring, and utilitarianism

You are a senior director of a 15-member work team at a small manufacturing company. The Human Relations department has informed you that many of your team members are resent the absences and lack of contribution of Jane, one of your most trusted and loyal team members. This resentment is hurting productivity across the group. Jane is a low-paid single mother. She has a problem child. She takes time off of work to deal with the child. She continues to have difficulty finding child care which causes her to often be late. You have repeatedly discussed these issues with her with no improvement. It is a great embarrassment with upper management to have the Human Relations department involved in any group’s productivity problems. As you are being considered for promotion, you want to avoid any fallout from these problems.

In this situation, I would be concerned about….
1. …doing what an exemplary leader would do in the situation. 1 2 3 4 5
2. …fulfilling my obligations as the leader-in-charge. 1 2 3 4 5
3. …treating everyone fairly. 1 2 3 4 5
4. … brings success in my mission. 1 2 3 4 5
5. … does the greatest good for the greatest number. 1 2 3 4 5
6. … builds good relationships. 1 2 3 4 5
Appendix C: Ethical Leadership Style Questionnaire Version 3.0 (Two Choices)

Ethical Leadership Style Questionnaire – Forced Choice v3.0

As a participant in this study, you will be presented with a number of situations and asked to select one of two choices. It will take approximately 25 minutes to complete the questionnaire. Your replies will be completely anonymous, so do not put your name anywhere on the form.

Please begin by responding to the following demographic questions:

Demographic information:
1. Age in years: _____________
2. Gender: __________
3. Level of Education: h.s. _________ college _________ graduate _________
4. Number of years in management: ____________
5. What is the largest number of employees who have reported to you: ______
6. What industry do you work in? __________
7. What country do you live in? ____________

Instructions
Consider the following situations. For each situation, place yourself in the role of the leader or manager and then think about how you would respond to the situation. For each situation, indicate your preferred choice from the two options listed after each situation. There are no ‘right’ or ‘wrong’ answers.

The two options will be selected from the following set of options:
• Do what an exemplary leader should do in this situation: this includes acting with excellence of character, integrity, faithfulness to principles, and virtue.
• Do what is fair: this includes acting justly and with equity.
• Do what is best for the most people: this includes helping the most people overall and creating the greatest total happiness.
• Do what is in my best interest: includes meeting my goals, being successful, and in my self interest.
• Fulfill my responsibilities: includes doing my duty, fulfilling obligations, and respecting other’s rights.
• Do what is best for my relationships: includes building and maintaining caring relationships.
1. Your son is a poor soccer player, but he wants to play more. His coach is an employee of yours. You are considering pressuring your employee to give your son more playing time.
   What would you do?
   - ☐ I would do what is best for the most people.
   - ☐ I would do what is in my best interest.

2. A single mother has trouble coming into work on time because of child care issues. Other employees are upset because they come in on time. You have been asked to address the issue.
   What would you do?
   - ☐ I would do what an exemplary leader would do in this situation.
   - ☐ I would do what is fair.

3. You have an employee who improves overall productivity by helping lots of people, but doesn’t get his own job done. You are considering whether you should discipline him.
   What would you do?
   - ☐ I would do what is best for the most people.
   - ☐ I would do what an exemplary leader would do in this situation.

4. You are setting up processes for your company. You can set them up to make to make your group’s work easier than other groups’ work.
   What would you do?
   - ☐ I would do what is in my best interest.
   - ☐ I would do what is fair.

5. You are a team leader and your team is given a bonus for team performance. Some employees have made greater contributions than others. Morale is low because there have been no bonuses for years. You are considering how you should allocate the bonus across team members.
   What would you do?
   - ☐ I would do what is best for the most people.
   - ☐ I would do what is fair.
6. Your team is overworked, but you can get a bonus if you can improve group productivity up some. If you reduce the workload, you will not get a bonus. What would you do?
   - I would do what is in my best interest.
   - I would do what an exemplary leader would do in this situation.

7. You catch your boss, who is a good friend, misrepresenting the financial reports. You know he will be furious and punish you if you make it an issue. What would you do?
   - I would do what is best for the most people.
   - I would do what is best for my relationships.

8. You have a job opening in your group to fill. You have four candidates: one is more productive, one is a friend, one works well with the people in your group, and one is your boss’ son. You must pick the person. What would you do?
   - I would do what is in my best interest.
   - I would do what is best in fulfilling my responsibilities.

9. You catch your boss taking credit for someone else’s ideas. You are considering calling him out on the behavior. What would you do?
   - I would do what is fair.
   - I would do what is best for my relationships.

10. Because of company policy, you are supposed to fine an employee for breaking their laptop. However you know it was an accident and that it would be a hardship for this employee to pay this fine. What would you do?
    - I would do what an exemplary leader would do in this situation.
    - I would do what is best in fulfilling my responsibilities.
11. You hear your friend make an offensive sexual remark. You are supposed to report it, but you believe that a warning can deal with the situation. What would you do?
- [ ] I would do what is best in fulfilling my responsibilities.
- [ ] I would do what is best for my relationships.

12. Your best friend, who is an employee of yours, asks to use the company copier for personal use. Departmental policy prohibits personal use of the copier, but it is common for employees to violate the policy. What would you do?
- [ ] I would do what an exemplary leader would do in this situation.
- [ ] I would do what is best for my relationships.

13. At a business lunch with an employee of the opposite gender, they make a vulgar sexual comment about sexting. The company policy says all inappropriate sexual comments must be reported. What would you do?
- [ ] I would do what is fair.
- [ ] I would do what is best in fulfilling my responsibilities.

14. A friend of yours who works in a different group in your company is having productivity problems because of drinking. Someone has asked you to bring him into your group to protect him and help him with his problem. What would you do?
- [ ] I would do what is in my best interest.
- [ ] I would do what is best for my relationships.

15. Your group wants to allow individuals to have flexible starting and stopping times to help their schedules. Upper management wants fixed time because they believe fixed times are more effective. You are asked to set attendance policy. What would you do?
- [ ] I would do what is best for the most people.
- [ ] I would do what is best in fulfilling my responsibilities.
16. You are a manager in a purchasing department. One of your suppliers offers to give you a free laptop or to give your group a free lunch. Your company policy allows you to accept either offer.

What would you do?

☐ I would do what is in my best interest.

☐ I would do what is best for the most people.

17. You have a chance to win a consulting contract however a key person on your team is restricted from doing the consulting because of a non-compete clause. You could however use this person only in the back office where they would not be visible to the client.

What would you do?

☐ I would do what is fair.

☐ I would do what is in my best interest.

18. You have a product that has some known defects that could hurt people. Your engineers say that no products are totally free of defects. They say the quality of your product is as good as any other product on the market. The redesign will be costly and may make your product unprofitable.

What would you do?

☐ I would do what is fair.

☐ I would do what is best for the most people.

19. You want to do business in a new country. In discussion with that company’s government, a government official asks you to make a contribution to a charitable foundation in that country.

What would you do?

☐ I would do what an exemplary leader would do in this situation.

☐ I would do what is in my best interest.

20. You calculate the budget that you need next year and are about to submit it when another manager tells you that you should add 10% to what you claim you need because budgets are always cut 10%. He says everyone does it.

What would you do?

☐ I would do what an exemplary leader would do in this situation.

☐ I would do what is best for the most people.
21. You have to choose one of two employees to layoff. Pat is a long time good friend, and a very good friend of your boss, but Pat’s performance has dropped off significantly lately because of long term problems at home. Chris is a solid performer, but regularly completes work late and is harshly critical of minorities in your company.
   What would you do?
   - I would do what is best in fulfilling my responsibilities.
   - I would do what is in my best interest.

22. You have an employee who has been having performance problems and making it hard for your group to meet its work quota. This person was recommended to you as a solid performer. Now you believe their former manager had problems with them and just wanted to get rid of them. If you give them a good recommendation, leaving out the performance problems, you have an opportunity to pass them off to another group.
   What would you do?
   - I would do what is best in fulfilling my responsibilities.
   - I would do what is best for the most people.

23. At the copy machine you find a copy of your boss’ trip voucher. In it you notice that your boss has listed you as an attendee at a lunch that you did not attend. This seems to be done to hide that the lunch exceeded company allowances.
   What would you do?
   - I would do what is best for my relationships.
   - I would do what is in my best interest.

24. You have a top employee that you desperately need. You find out about a job opening in another group that would be much better for this employee’s career. You consider telling them about the opening.
   What would you do?
   - I would do what is fair.
   - I would do what an exemplary leader would do in this situation.
25. Your boss is competing with another boss for a promotion. You hear your boss complaining about the other boss’ work on a project being very poor quality. However, you know that work to be of exemplary quality. What would you do?

☐ I would do what is best in fulfilling my responsibilities.

☐ I would do what an exemplary leader would do in this situation.

26. You go to an office party at your boss’ house and many people are upset to see a company typewriter and office supplies there in violation of company policy. What would you do?

☐ I would do what is best for my relationships.

☐ I would do what is best for the most people.

27. You hear a group of male employees making plans to go to lunch for one of the employee’s birthday. That employee suggests a local restaurant where the female servers are scantily dressed. They discuss going but keeping it a secret from the female employees. What would you do?

☐ I would do what is best in fulfilling my responsibilities.

☐ I would do what is fair.

28. A friend of yours who has a child with a serious long term illness is exhibiting low performance and is having trouble putting in a full day at work. You catch them listing 40 hours for a week when you know they only worked 38 hours. What would you do?

☐ I would do what is best for my relationships.

☐ I would do what is fair.

29. You work have a non-compete clause prohibiting you from competing with your old company. You have a friend who is competing with your old company. Over drinks with your friend he asks you how to win a big deal where he is competing with your old company. You know how he can win the deal, but are not sure if you should tell him. What would you do?

☐ I would do what is best for my relationships.

☐ I would do what an exemplary leader would do in this situation.
30. You are at a Girl Scout event where a bag with a ribbon for each girl is passed around. You see one girl slyly take two ribbons, such that the last girl is left without a ribbon.
   What would you do?
   - I would do what is best in fulfilling my responsibilities.
   - I would do what is best for my relationships.

31. You are serving chicken sandwiches at an important affair at your house. In the middle, your son informs you that he put his fishing worms in the refrigerator and they escaped into the chicken container, but he says he wiped off the chicken.
   What would you do?
   - I would do what is best for the most people.
   - I would do what is in my best interest.

32. Doing your best you can finish your quota in much less than the allotted time. If you produce more, the quota will likely be increased. Some of your coworkers are struggling to meet their quotas currently.
   What would you do?
   - I would do what an exemplary leader would do in this situation.
   - I would do what is fair.

33. There is an employee who wears strong perfume that significantly bothers her coworkers in her vicinity. You ask her to use less or try another scent, but she refuses saying that it is “part of her identity.”
   What would you do?
   - I would do what is best for the most people.
   - I would do what is fair.

34. A good friend of yours who is a coworker asks you if he can teach an upcoming computer course to your company. While he could do a good job, there are several other coworkers who could do a much better job.
   What would you do?
   - I would do what is best for the most people.
   - I would do what is best for my relationships.
35. You call into work sick so you can go to a ball game. On the way there, you run into your boss at lunch and see him cheating on his wife. He sees you. The next day, he is silent on the matter.
What would you do?
☐ I would do what is in my best interest.
☐ I would do what an exemplary leader would do in this situation.

36. At a rummage sale, you find some designer baby clothes with the original price tag on them for $50. You buy them for a coworker for $1. She is very flattered, and when your birthday comes a few days later she gives you a $50 gift which is unusual and not something she can afford.
What would you do?
☐ I would do what is in my best interest.
☐ I would do what is fair.

37. Your daughter wants to have a breast enhancement because she is entering corporate sales and feels it will help her get more sales for herself and her sales team.
What would you do?
☐ I would do what is best for the most people.
☐ I would do what is best in fulfilling my responsibilities.

38. You are voting on whether to accept a 20% pay cut or see 1,000 jobs cut. Your job is safe. You have many close friends at your company that you have worked with for many years.
What would you do?
☐ I would do what is in my best interest.
☐ I would do what is best for my relationships.

39. You are a college basketball coach at a small community college. One of your players is the daughter of the contributor who paid for the basketball facility. Based on the daughter’s skills she should rarely play or be dropped from the team. This would devastate the daughter and the contributor.
What would you do?
☐ I would do what is best for the most people.
☐ I would do what an exemplary leader would do in this situation.
40. You are the director of the neighborhood food cooperative. A member—a single mother with four children—is caught shoplifting $30 in groceries. You suspect she has been stealing for years. Do you press charges?
What would you do?
☐ I would do what an exemplary leader would do in this situation.
☐ I would do what is best in fulfilling my responsibilities.

41. You work at an electronics store. You get a large employee discount that you are only supposed to use for yourself. You could purchase an item and sell it and make a quick $300 profit with no chance of discovery.
What would you do?
☐ I would do what is in my best interest.
☐ I would do what is best in fulfilling my responsibilities.

42. Driving into work late one day, you see your brother’s wife sneaking into a notorious hotel with a married man.
What would you do?
☐ I would do what an exemplary leader would do in this situation.
☐ I would do what is best for my relationships.

43. You teach a small groups class at a major university. You assign the students into teams where they all get the same grade. The contributions vary widely between the students with some having attendance issues. Some of the students complain bitterly.
What would you do?
☐ I would do what is fair.
☐ I would do what is best in fulfilling my responsibilities.

44. It is prior to the beginning of the year and you find out that your child has been placed with a teacher that has a reputation as being a poor teacher. You consider putting a word into the principle to try and get them swapped with another student with a better teacher.
What would you do?
☐ I would do what is fair.
☐ I would do what is best for my relationships.
45. Because of poor business conditions you have decided that in four months you will layoff an employee who has worked for the company for 15 years. Consistent with company policy you cannot tell that employee until the day they are laid off. You hear that employee discussing how they are getting ready to purchase an expensive new house. The employee can barely afford the house; and if they were laid off it would probably take them years to find employment at the same pay level.
   What would you do?
   □ I would do what is best for my relationships.
   □ I would do what is best in fulfilling my responsibilities.

46. You are the sole owner of a company that buys blood for as little at 15 cents a pint in rural west Africa and sells it in the during disasters for $25 a pint. During a recent disaster you netted nearly a quarter of a million dollars of profit. You are considering how ethical this practice is.
   What would you do?
   □ I would do what is in my best interest.
   □ I would do what is best for the most people.

47. You have a large inventory of children’s sleepwear that is banned in the U.S. as toxic. You can donate it in Brazil, Iraq, and Africa where it is legal and may be safer than much of the sleepwear sold there.
   What would you do?
   □ I would do what an exemplary leader would do in this situation.
   □ I would do what is best for the most people.

48. Your competition introduces a better product than yours. This leaves your company struggling financially and considering mass layoffs. You consider trying to market your product using a celebrity endorsement.
   What would you do?
   □ I would do what is fair.
   □ I would do what is best for the most people.
49. Your company processes email information. The Chinese government wants you to reveal the name of a journalist who posted information on the Tiananmen Square demonstrations. The journalist had posted the information anonymously, but he used an email based at your company. Chinese law requires the email information be turned over.
   What would you do?
   - I would do what is best in fulfilling my responsibilities.
   - I would do what is best for the most people.

50. You are an employee at a nuclear power plant in Japan. An earthquake hits and damages the nuclear core. You are considering if you should ask employees to stay at the plant and try to prevent a meltdown even though it is enormously risky.
   What would you do?
   - I would do what is best for my relationships.
   - I would do what is best for the most people.

51. You are the executive director of a center. You have raised $860,000 for the center. At a staff meeting someone asks “how much have you raised?” In an effort to impress them you consider exaggerating a bit and responding “about a million dollars.”
   What would you do?
   - I would do what an exemplary leader would do in this situation.
   - I would do what is in my best interest.

52. At the bank, you enter your information to withdraw five $20 bills. You see your account decreased by that amount, but you notice that the machine dispensed five $50 bills. You can go into the bank to rectify the error.
   What would you do?
   - I would do what is fair.
   - I would do what is in my best interest.
53. As a professor, other professors regularly fail a student guilty of plagiarism. One of your favorite students buys an essay, turns it in for a grade, feels guilty about it, and confesses to you. You must decide if you flunk the student.

What would you do?

☐ I would do what is best for my relationships.

☐ I would do what is fair.

54. You work in sales at an optical store and have not met your sales quota. Jimmy has broken his glasses and his parents are agonizing over the price of replacing them. A competitor is selling identical glasses for half-price. You could send Jimmy’s parents there. Completing the sale will achieve your quota.

What would you do?

☐ I would do what is best in fulfilling my responsibilities.

☐ I would do what is in my best interest.

55. Your best friend’s brother, Frank, works at your company and you helped him get the job. A career opportunity has become open at another company, which you think is a good fit for Frank. However, Frank is a top performer and his departure would likely make it very difficult for your team to meet their performance quotas.

What would you do?

☐ I would do what is best for my relationships.

☐ I would do what is in my best interest.

56. One of your talented employees is habitually late for work in the morning—but stays late into the evening when necessary. The company policy is to “dock” latecomer’s wages. The rule is applied other employees.

What would you do?

☐ I would do what is fair.

☐ I would do what an exemplary leader would do in this situation.

57. It is revealed that an employee has a problem with pornography and has been watching pornography at work. The company values include both “honesty and integrity” as well as “the importance of the individual.”

What would you do?

☐ I would do what is best in fulfilling my responsibilities.

☐ I would do what an exemplary leader would do in this situation.
58. At your company, you have been accused of discriminating against women in your hiring practices. A new position opens up. You could hire the female over male candidate, even though the man has slightly better qualifications and improve your position in the company.
What would you do?

☐ I would do what is best for my relationships.

☐ I would do what an exemplary leader would do in this situation.

59. Your boss frequently asks you to do non-work related chores like shopping for family gifts and picking up dry cleaning. Your boss does not allow others to do their own non-work related chores on company time.
What would you do?

☐ I would do what is best in fulfilling my responsibilities.

☐ I would do what is fair.

60. You put in security cameras because of a theft problem. You learn that one employee is selling marijuana, another is planning to quit soon, three are getting food stamps illegally, and one coworker is out to undermine you. You know your employees will be furious if they find they were recorded.
What would you do?

☐ I would do what is best for my relationships.

☐ I would do what is best in fulfilling my responsibilities.
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Ethical Leadership Style Questionnaire – Forced Choice v 4.12.45

As a participant in this study, you will be asked to provide some basic demographic information and respond to a number of situations. For each situation, you will be asked to select one of two choices. The survey will take approximately 20 minutes to complete. Your replies will be anonymous, so please do not place your name or identify yourself on the survey.

Demographic Information

1. What is your age in years?
   - □ 18-29
   - □ 30-44
   - □ 45-59
   - □ 60 or older

2. What is your gender?
   - □ Male
   - □ Female

3. What is the highest level of education you have completed? (select one)
   - □ Some high school, no diploma
   - □ High school graduate or equivalent (e.g., GED)
   - □ Some college, no degree
   - □ Associate degree
   - □ Bachelor degree
   - □ Master degree
   - □ Doctoral degree

3. What is your number of total years in management (years need not be consecutive):
   - □ 0-5
   - □ 6-10
   - □ 11-15
   - □ 16-20
5. What is the largest number of employees who have reported to you (either directly or indirectly)? ______

6. What industry do you currently work in?
- Advertising/Marketing
- Agriculture
- Airline or Aerospace (including Defense)
- Automotive
- Business Support or Logistics
- Construction
- Machinery or Homes
- Education
- Entertainment or Leisure
- Finance or Financial Services
- Food and Beverages
- Government
- Health Care or Pharmaceuticals
- Insurance
- Law Enforcement
- Manufacturing
- Religious or Nonprofit
- Retail or Consumer Durables
- Real Estate
- Telecommunications
- Technology, Internet, or Electronics
- Utilities, Energy, or Extraction
- Other __________________
7. What country do you live in? ____________
Instructions

You will be asked to consider a series of scenarios. For each scenario, place yourself in the role of the leader or manager, and think about how you would respond to the situation. There are no right or wrong answers. For each scenario, indicate your preferred response from the two options provided.

Below is a list of the potential responses and a description of the behaviors associated with each option.

- **I would do what a good person would do**: This option includes exhibiting excellence of character, acting with integrity, and being faithful to one’s principles. This option includes employing virtues such as courage, honesty, and loyalty.

- **I would do what is fair**: This option includes acting with justice, being equitable to others, and treating others fairly. It also includes distributing benefits and burdens while treating everyone equally.

- **I would do what benefits the most people**: This option includes doing what helps the most people overall and what creates the greatest total happiness. It also includes doing the greatest good for the greatest number.

- **I would do what benefits me the most**: This option includes achieving my goals, being successful in my assigned task, and advancing my career. It also includes doing things that are in my self-interest.

- **I would do my duty**: This option includes following the rules, meeting my responsibilities, fulfilling my obligations, and adhering to company policy. Rules in this context may be explicit or implicit.

- **I would be sensitive and caring in my close relationships**: This option includes building and maintaining caring relationships, nurturing relationships, and being responsive to the needs of others. It gives special consideration to those with whom I share a personal bond or commitment.
Questions:

1. You are the chairperson of the board. Without proper authority, a board member seems to be attempting to recruit some new suppliers. The board member has prior relationships with these potential suppliers, and you are concerned the board member might be sharing proprietary company information. What would you do in this situation? (Choose one.)
   - I would do what benefits the most people.
   - I would do what a good person would do.

2. A single parent has trouble arriving at work on time because of childcare issues. Other employees are upset about this employee’s tardiness because they arrive on time. You have been asked to address the issue. What would you do in this situation? (Choose one.)
   - I would be sensitive and caring in my close relationships.
   - I would do what benefits me the most.

3. You have an employee who improves overall productivity by helping others with their work-related problems; however, this employee does not get individual job responsibilities completed. You have mentioned this to the employee before and are considering whether you should use disciplinary measures. What would you do in this situation? (Choose one.)
   - I would be sensitive and caring in my close relationships.
   - I would do what a good person would do.

4. You are setting up production processes for your company. You can set these up to make your group’s work easier than other groups’ work. What would you do in this situation? (Choose one.)
   - I would do my duty.
   - I would do what a good person would do.
5. You are a team leader and your team is given a bonus for performance. Employee morale is low because there have been no bonuses for years. Some of your team members have made greater contributions than others. You are considering how you should allocate the bonus across team members. What would you do in this situation? (Choose one.)

☐ I would be sensitive and caring in my close relationships.
☐ I would do what is fair.

6. Your job is in danger if you do not improve your team’s productivity. Your team is overworked, but you think you can improve productivity by putting additional pressure on the team. What would you do in this situation? (Choose one.)

☐ I would do what benefits me the most.
☐ I would do what is fair.

7. You are the president of a manufacturing division, supervising a plant where workers are upset by layoff rumors. Layoffs are pending but have not been announced because your board is concerned about strikes and damage to the machinery. Pointing out that the plan has not been announced, your board has asked you to tell the workers their jobs are safe. What would you do in this situation? (Choose one.)

☐ I would do what is fair.
☐ I would do my duty.

8. You have a job opening to fill in your group, and there are three candidates. One is more productive, one is a friend who works well with the people in your group, and the other is your boss’s son. You must pick the person. What would you do in this situation? (Choose one.)

☐ I would do my duty.
☐ I would do what benefits the most people.
9. You are CEO of a cosmetics company and have come under criticism by the media and some of your own employees for launching an advertising campaign that is highly successful but objectifies women. What would you do in this situation? (Choose one.)

☐ I would do what is fair.

☐ I would do what benefits the most people.

10. Your boss tells his boss that your project is late because of late customer inputs. However, you know that the customer did not give late inputs. What would you do in this situation? (Choose one.)

☐ I would do what benefits me the most.

☐ I would do my duty.

11. Because of poor business conditions, you have decided that in four months, you will lay off an employee who has worked for the company for 15 years. Consistent with company policy, you cannot tell that employee until the day the employee is laid off. You hear the employee discussing the upcoming purchase of an expensive new house. You believe the employee can barely afford the house. If the employee is laid off, it will probably take this individual years to find employment at the same pay level. What would you do in this situation? (Choose one.)

☐ I would do my duty.

☐ I would be sensitive and caring in my close relationships.

12. Your vice president sets up a public website advertising that thousands of restaurants use your dinnerware. As a director, you know that your company sells to only a fraction of that number. A correction would greatly embarrass your vice president and the company. What would you do in this situation? (Choose one.)

☐ I would do what benefits the most people.

☐ I would be sensitive and caring in my close relationships.

13. At a business lunch, an employee of a different gender than you makes an inappropriate comment about sexting. The lunch attendees are looking to see
how you will deal with this situation. What would you do in this situation? (Choose one.)

☐ I would do what is fair.
☐ I would do what a good person would do.

14. At the copy machine, you find a copy of your subordinate’s trip voucher and notice that your subordinate has listed someone as an attendee at a lunch; however, you are aware that the person your subordinate listed was not at the lunch. You believe this was done to hide the fact that the lunch exceeded company allowances. What would you do in this situation? (Choose one.)

☐ I would do what a good person would do.
☐ I would do what benefits me the most.

15. Against company policy, your boss is flying first-class to a conference while insisting that other attendees from your company fly coach-class. This has upset many employees and has had a debilitating impact on the company culture. What would you do in this situation? (Choose one.)

☐ I would do what benefits me the most.
☐ I would do what benefits the most people.

16. You have a manager who gives employees very positive verbal reviews face-to-face. This keeps the employees happy. However, HR has limitations on the number of positive reviews allowed. HR reports to you that, unknown to the employees, the manager is turning in less positive written reviews. What would you do in this situation? (Choose one.)

☐ I would do what benefits the most people.
☐ I would be sensitive and caring in my close relationships.

17. You are managing partner of a financial consulting firm, and to deliver on a big contract with an important client, you need to put your best tax consultant on the project. However, the tax accountant used to work for the client and signed a non-compete clause before leaving the client. You consider using the tax accountant only in the back office where the person
would not be visible to the client. What would you do in this situation? (Choose one.)

☐ I would do what benefits the most people.
☐ I would do what benefits me the most.

18. You are the leader of a manufacturing team and learn that your employees are falsifying product quality results to sell more products. If you report the matter, most of them will lose their jobs, you may lose yours, and your company will take a significant hit to its reputation... What would you do in this situation? (Choose one.)

☐ I would be sensitive and caring in my close relationships.
☐ I would do what benefits me the most.

19. You are the fundraising director of a charity. You have raised $860,000 for the charity. At a staff meeting, someone asks how much you have raised. In an effort to encourage additional giving, you consider exaggerating a bit and responding that you have raised about a million dollars. What would you do in this situation? (Choose one.)

☐ I would do what benefits me the most.
☐ I would do what is fair.

20. Your organization has impending layoffs because of budget problems. You are about to submit your true budget needs when another manager tells you that you should add 20% to your budget because budgets are always cut by 20%. The manager also tells you that all the other managers do this. What would you do in this situation? (Choose one.)

☐ I would do what a good person would do.
☐ I would do what is fair.

21. You are a regional manager at a chain and discover that employees are not honoring warranties. This action boosts the employees’ sales results. When their sales results are boosted, so is your bonus. What would you do in this situation? (Choose one.)

☐ I would do what benefits the most people.
☐ I would do my duty.
22. You have an employee who has been having performance problems, which in turn is making it hard for your group to meet its work quota. This person was recommended to you as a solid performer. You now believe the person’s former manager had problems with the employee and just wanted to get rid of the person. If you give the underperforming employee a good recommendation, leaving out the performance problems, you will have an opportunity to pass the employee off to another group. What would you do in this situation? (Choose one.)

☐ I would be sensitive and caring in my close relationships.

☐ I would do my duty.

23. A friend of yours who works in a different group in your company is having productivity problems because this friend of yours is difficult to work with. Upper management has asked you to bring this person into your group to protect the person, but you know this will have a negative impact on your group’s performance. What would you do in this situation? (Choose one.)

☐ I would do my duty.

☐ I would do what a good person would do.

24. Your team is hard-pressed to complete a critical project. You hear about a job opening for one of your key employees that would be much better for that employee’s career. If this individual leaves the team, it would put the project in danger. What would you do in this situation? (Choose one.)

☐ I would do what benefits the most people.

☐ I would do what a good person would do.

25. You are a senior executive at a company that may not legally contribute to political campaigns. You learn that your company was awarded a large contract from the state shortly after several members of your board made large contributions to the governor’s campaign fund. What would you do in this situation? (Choose one.)

☐ I would be sensitive and caring in my close relationships.

☐ I would do what a good person would do.
26. You are a senior executive of your company and you desire to do business in a foreign country. In discussions with that country’s government, a government official asks you to make a multi-million dollar contribution to a charitable foundation in that country. You learn that the foundation is run by a close relative of the government official who many people believe is using the foundation to siphon off money to enrich the family. What would you do in this situation? (Choose one.)

☐ I would do what benefits the most people.

☐ I would do what is fair.

27. Your organization is downsizing. You have been directed to lay off three of your 20 employees. Unofficially, you have been advised that upper management wants to retain as many younger employees as possible because they earn less. Many of your most competent employees are older. What would you do in this situation? (Choose one.)

☐ I would do my duty.

☐ I would do what benefits me the most.

28. An employee of yours has a child with a serious illness. The employee is having trouble fulfilling obligations at work. You learn from your administrative assistant that this employee claimed 40 hours on a timesheet for a week when the employee actually only worked 30 hours. What would you do in this situation? (Choose one.)

☐ I would do what a good person would do.

☐ I would do what benefits me the most.

29. You are CEO of a manufacturing company that has an aging plant in a poor region of the southern United States. You are receiving pressure from your board of directors to save money by closing the plant and moving it to foreign country where environmental standards are less stringent and labor costs are much lower. If you close the plant, more than 500 people will lose their jobs. What would you do in this situation? (Choose one.)

☐ I would do what is fair.
30. You are COO of your company and report directly to the CEO. The CFO, who is a peer and also reports directly to the CEO, has been spreading false rumors about you to undermine your credibility and gain favor with the CEO. You have talked numerous times with both the CFO and CEO about the situation, but nothing has changed. You are now considering responding by going public to expose the CFO’s underhanded methods and repair your reputation. What would you do in this situation? (Choose one.)

☐ I would do my duty.
☐ I would do what is fair.

31. You are the manager at an oil-change service station that offers standard and deluxe oil. If your employees sell less standard oil and more deluxe oil, you get a bigger bonus, but in reality there is very little difference between the two oils. You hear employees telling customers that they can save money by requesting the standard oil, which performs just as well as the deluxe oil. This hurts your bonus. What would you do in this situation? (Choose one.)

☐ I would do what a good person would do.
☐ I would be sensitive and caring in my close relationships.

32. You are a manager and some of your employees can finish their quotas in much less than the allotted time to do so. If upper management becomes aware of this, they will want you to increase the quotas. Some of your employees are unable to meet their current quotas. What would you do in this situation? (Choose one.)

☐ I would do what is fair.
☐ I would do my duty.

33. You are the president of a trucking company. Federal regulations specify that truck drivers must have at least nine hours of rest between long hauls. You hear that many drivers may not be taking this rest time, which generates more revenue for you and for them. Your legal department tells you that because these drivers are subcontractors, it is their responsibility to follow the regulations and you are better off not asking about the matter. What would you do in this situation? (Choose one.)
I would do what benefits me the most.

I would do what is fair.

34. You are the chief financial officer, and you are aware that the chief executive officer and other members of the senior leadership team want to provide somewhat exaggerated financial information to keep your stock price high. The entire senior management team holds significant stock positions. What would you do in this situation? (Choose one.)

☐ I would do my duty.

☐ I would do what benefits me the most.

35. While on lunch break, you see one of your managers who called in sick for the day, at the restaurant, skipping work. This manager seems to be interviewing with a competitor. This manager also sees you. The next day, this manager is silent on the matter. What would you do in this situation? (Choose one.)

☐ I would be sensitive and caring in my close relationships.

☐ I would do what benefits the most people.

36. Your group is working on a project for the federal government under a fixed-price contract. Your group is close to completing the job but cannot quite meet the requirements. If you try to meet the requirements, you will go over budget and lose money on the contract. However, there are some loopholes and vague areas in the contract you could exploit. What would you do in this situation? (Choose one.)

☐ I would do what a good person would do.

☐ I would do what benefits the most people.

37. You have a position that you badly need to fill in your group. You requested that HR provide you with candidates who are highly experienced with respect to your group’s technical work. However, the five candidates you have interviewed so far are relatively young with good, but not excellent, skills. You suspect that HR is discriminating against older, more experienced candidates and screening them out. What would you do in this situation? (Choose one.)

☐ I would do what benefits the most people.
38. You have a subordinate who, without your request or encouragement, is acting as a snitch, reporting back to you when other employees are late or make a mistake. This information makes your job easier. Your other subordinates suspect that you are asking this subordinate to be a spy and are becoming resentful. What would you do in this situation? (Choose one.)

☐ I would do what a good person would do.
☐ I would do what is fair.

39. You are an inventory manager at a large clothing retailer. You have an excess inventory of children’s sleepwear that is banned in the U.S. because it contains toxic materials. You can donate this sleepwear to charities in Brazil, Iraq, and Africa where it is legal and may be safer than much of the sleepwear sold there. What would you do in this situation? (Choose one.)

☐ I would do what is fair.
☐ I would do what benefits the most people.

40. You are the director of the neighborhood food cooperative. A member—a single parent with four children—is caught shoplifting $30 in groceries. You suspect this person has been stealing for years. You consider pressing charges. What would you do in this situation? (Choose one.)

☐ I would do my duty.
☐ I would do what benefits the most people.

41. Two new employees have joined your accounting team right out of school. They are regularly found surfing the Internet or texting on their phones. Your accounting work regularly requires overtime at the end of the month to get the financial reports completed. These employees refuse to do any overtime, which shifts work to other team members. The other team members are getting resentful and upset. What would you do in this situation? (Choose one.)

☐ I would do what benefits me the most.
☐ I would be sensitive and caring in my close relationships.
42. You have been accused of discriminating against a particular gender in your hiring practices. A new position opens up. You could hire a candidate of one gender over a candidate of another gender, even though the latter candidate has slightly better qualifications. Hiring the former candidate would let you address this accusation and improve your reputation in the company. What would you do in this situation? (Choose one)

☐ I would do what a good person would do.

☐ I would do my duty.

43. Your director is frequently asking an employee who reports to you to do non-work related chores saying it is part of the job. These chores include shopping for gifts and picking up dry cleaning. Your director does not allow other employees to do their own non-work related chores on company time. What would you do in this situation? (Choose one.)

☐ I would do what benefits me the most.

☐ I would do what a good person would do.

44. You are a professor. One of your best students buys an essay online and turns it in for a grade. Later in the term, the student begins to feel guilty and confesses to you that the paper was purchased. It is the norm at the university to fail a student guilty of plagiarism. You must decide if you will flunk the student. What would you do in this situation? (Choose one.)

☐ I would do what is fair.

☐ I would be sensitive and caring in my close relationships.

45. Because of theft problems at your business, you put in hidden security cameras. Reviewing the tapes, you learn that one employee has been making mistakes and blaming them on another associate. You also learn that several other employees are gossiping in a way that hurts teamwork. You know your employees will be very upset if they find they were recorded. What would you do in this situation? (Choose one.)

☐ I would be sensitive and caring in my close relationships.

☐ I would do my duty.

Thank you for completing this survey.
Appendix E: Ethical Leadership Style Questionnaire
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Ethical Leadership Style Questionnaire – Forced Choice v 4.12.15

As a participant in this study, you will be asked to provide some basic demographic information and respond to a number of situations. For each situation, you will be asked to select one of two choices. The survey will take approximately 20 minutes to complete. Your replies will be anonymous, so please do not place your name or identify yourself on the survey.

Demographic Information

1. What is your age in years?
   - □ 18-29
   - □ 30-44
   - □ 45-59
   - □ 60 or older

2. What is your gender?
   - □ Male
   - □ Female

3. What is the highest level of education you have completed? (select one)
   - □ Some high school, no diploma
   - □ High school graduate or equivalent (e.g., GED)
   - □ Some college, no degree
   - □ Associate degree
   - □ Bachelor degree
   - □ Master degree
   - □ Doctoral degree

3. What is your number of total years in management (years need not be consecutive):
   - □ 0-5
   - □ 6-10
   - □ 11-15
   - □ 16-20
5. What is the largest number of employees who have reported to you (either directly or indirectly)? ______

6. What industry do you currently work in?

☐ Advertising/Marketing
☐ Agriculture
☐ Airline or Aerospace (including Defense)
☐ Automotive
☐ Business Support or Logistics
☐ Construction
☐ Machinery or Homes
☐ Education
☐ Entertainment or Leisure
☐ Finance or Financial Services
☐ Food and Beverages
☐ Government
☐ Health Care or Pharmaceuticals
☐ Insurance
☐ Law Enforcement
☐ Manufacturing
☐ Religious or Nonprofit
☐ Retail or Consumer Durables
☐ Real Estate
☐ Telecommunications
☐ Technology, Internet, or Electronics
☐ Utilities, Energy, or Extraction
☐ Other ____________________
7. What country do you live in? ____________
Instructions

You will be asked to consider a series of scenarios. For each scenario, place yourself in the role of the leader or manager, and think about how you would respond to the situation. There are no right or wrong answers. For each scenario, indicate your preferred response from the two options provided.

Below is a list of the potential responses and a description of the behaviors associated with each option.

- *I would do what a good person would do:* This option includes exhibiting excellence of character, acting with integrity, and being faithful to one’s principles. This option includes employing virtues such as courage, honesty, and loyalty.

- *I would do what is fair:* This option includes acting with justice, being equitable to others, and treating others fairly. It also includes distributing benefits and burdens while treating everyone equally.

- *I would do what benefits the most people:* This option includes doing what helps the most people overall and what creates the greatest total happiness. It also includes doing the greatest good for the greatest number.

- *I would do what benefits me the most:* This option includes achieving my goals, being successful in my assigned task, and advancing my career. It also includes doing things that are in my self-interest.

- *I would do my duty:* This option includes following the rules, meeting my responsibilities, fulfilling my obligations, and adhering to company policy. Rules in this context may be explicit or implicit.

- *I would be sensitive and caring in my close relationships:* This option includes building and maintaining caring relationships, nurturing relationships, and being responsive to the needs of others. It gives special consideration to those with whom I share a personal bond or commitment.
Questions:

1. You are the chairperson of the board. Without proper authority, a board member seems to be attempting to recruit some new suppliers. The board member has prior relationships with these potential suppliers, and you are concerned the board member might be sharing proprietary company information. What would you do in this situation? (Choose one.)

☐ I would do what benefits the most people.

☐ I would do what a good person would do.

2. A single parent has trouble arriving at work on time because of childcare issues. Other employees are upset about this employee’s tardiness because they arrive on time. You have been asked to address the issue. What would you do in this situation? (Choose one.)

☐ I would be sensitive and caring in my close relationships.

☐ I would do what benefits me the most.

3. You are a team leader and your team is given a bonus for performance. Employee morale is low because there have been no bonuses for years. Some of your team members have made greater contributions than others. You are considering how you should allocate the bonus across team members. What would you do in this situation? (Choose one.)

☐ I would be sensitive and caring in my close relationships.

☐ I would do what is fair.
4. At the copy machine, you find a copy of your subordinate’s trip voucher and notice that your subordinate has listed someone as an attendee at a lunch; however, you are aware that the person your subordinate listed was not at the lunch. You believe this was done to hide the fact that the lunch exceeded company allowances. What would you do in this situation? (Choose one.)

☐ I would do what a good person would do.
☐ I would do what benefits me the most.

5. Against company policy, your boss is flying first-class to a conference while insisting that other attendees from your company fly coach-class. This has upset many employees and has had a debilitating impact on the company culture. What would you do in this situation? (Choose one.)

☐ I would do what benefits me the most.
☐ I would do what benefits the most people.

6. You have a manager who gives employees very positive verbal reviews face-to-face. This keeps the employees happy. However, HR has limitations on the number of positive reviews allowed. HR reports to you that, unknown to the employees, the manager is turning in less positive written reviews. What would you do in this situation? (Choose one.)

☐ I would do what benefits the most people.
☐ I would be sensitive and caring in my close relationships.

7. You are a regional manager at a chain and discover that employees are not honoring warranties. This action boosts the employees’ sales results. When their sales results are boosted, so is your bonus. What would you do in this situation? (Choose one.)

☐ I would do what benefits the most people.
☐ I would do my duty.
8. A friend of yours who works in a different group in your company is having productivity problems because this friend of yours is difficult to work with. Upper management has asked you to bring this person into your group to protect the person, but you know this will have a negative impact on your group’s performance. What would you do in this situation? (Choose one.)

☐ I would do my duty.
☐ I would do what a good person would do.

9. You are a senior executive at a company that may not legally contribute to political campaigns. You learn that your company was awarded a large contract from the state shortly after several members of your board made large contributions to the governor’s campaign fund. What would you do in this situation? (Choose one.)

☐ I would be sensitive and caring in my close relationships.
☐ I would do what a good person would do.

10. You are a senior executive of your company and you desire to do business in a foreign country. In discussions with that country’s government, a government official asks you to make a multi-million dollar contribution to a charitable foundation in that country. You learn that the foundation is run by a close relative of the government official who many people believe is using the foundation to siphon off money to enrich the family. What would you do in this situation? (Choose one.)

☐ I would do what benefits the most people.
☐ I would do what is fair.
11. You are a manager and some of your employees can finish their quotas in much less than the allotted time to do so. If upper management becomes aware of this, they will want you to increase the quotas. Some of your employees are unable to meet their current quotas. What would you do in this situation? (Choose one.)

☐ I would do what is fair.
☐ I would do my duty.

12. You are the president of a trucking company. Federal regulations specify that truck drivers must have at least nine hours of rest between long hauls. You hear that many drivers may not be taking this rest time, which generates more revenue for you and for them. Your legal department tells you that because these drivers are subcontractors, it is their responsibility to follow the regulations and you are better off not asking about the matter. What would you do in this situation? (Choose one.)

☐ I would do what benefits me the most.
☐ I would do what is fair.

13. You are the chief financial officer, and you are aware that the chief executive officer and other members of the senior leadership team want to provide somewhat exaggerated financial information to keep your stock price high. The entire senior management team holds significant stock positions. What would you do in this situation? (Choose one.)

☐ I would do my duty.
☐ I would do what benefits me the most.
14. You have a subordinate who, without your request or encouragement, is acting as a snitch, reporting back to you when other employees are late or make a mistake. This information makes your job easier. Your other subordinates suspect that you are asking this subordinate to be a spy and are becoming resentful. What would you do in this situation? (Choose one.)

☐ I would do what a good person would do.
☐ I would do what is fair.

15. Because of theft problems at your business, you put in hidden security cameras. Reviewing the tapes, you learn that one employee has been making mistakes and blaming them on another associate. You also learn that several other employees are gossiping in a way that hurts teamwork. You know your employees will be very upset if they find they were recorded. What would you do in this situation? (Choose one.)

☐ I would be sensitive and caring in my close relationships.
☐ I would do my duty.

Thank you for completing this survey.
## Appendix F: Leadership Construct Validation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>Task-Oriented</th>
<th>Relations-Oriented</th>
<th>Change-oriented</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Short term planning</td>
<td>Monitoring Operations &amp; Performance</td>
<td>Clarifying responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Situation</th>
<th>Short term planning</th>
<th>Monitoring Operations &amp; Performance</th>
<th>Clarifying responsibility</th>
<th>Supporting</th>
<th>Developing</th>
<th>Recognizing</th>
<th>Consulting</th>
<th>Empowering</th>
<th>External monitoring</th>
<th>Envisioning change</th>
<th>Encouraging innovative thinking</th>
<th>Taking personal risks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situation</td>
<td>Task-Oriented</td>
<td>Relations-Oriented</td>
<td>Change-oriented</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Short term planning</td>
<td>Monitoring Operations &amp; Performance</td>
<td>Clarifying responsibility</td>
<td>Supporting</td>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>Recognizing</td>
<td>Consulting</td>
<td>Empowering</td>
<td>External monitoring</td>
<td>Envisioning change</td>
<td>Encouraging innovative thinking</td>
<td>Taking personal risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Situation</td>
<td>Short term planning</td>
<td>Monitoring Operations &amp; Performance</td>
<td>Clarifying responsibility</td>
<td>Supporting</td>
<td>Developing</td>
<td>Recognizing</td>
<td>Consulting</td>
<td>Empowering</td>
<td>External monitoring</td>
<td>Envisioning change</td>
<td>Encouraging innovative thinking</td>
<td>Taking personal risks</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix G: Revision Iterations of the ELSQ

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pass</th>
<th>Vignettes</th>
<th>Structure</th>
<th>Question length</th>
<th>Scope</th>
<th>Panel Inputs</th>
<th>Action [Surveys taken]</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Modified original</td>
<td>Long</td>
<td>Business, leadership</td>
<td>Panels 11/23/2014, 12/3/2014; Consults 7/21/2015, 8/8/2015</td>
<td>Suspended in preference of forced choice</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>Forced choice x2</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Rapid prototyping by professors Northouse, Ludema, Chikeleze and researcher 10/15/2015</td>
<td>Forced-choice dual option accepted. 30 additional vignettes defined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Forced choice x2</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>10/16/2015, 10/17/2015, 11/1/2015, 11/17/2015</td>
<td>Expanded to 45 vignettes; 258 vignettes identified</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>Forced choice x2</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Review and feedback from pilot subjects</td>
<td>Pilot testing by 2 profs. and 18 doctoral candidates 11/21/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Forced choice x2</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Questions updated and expanded</td>
<td>8 versions based on feedback 11/21/2015 – 12/14/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>Forced choice x3</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Suggested statistical advantages of 3 options</td>
<td>5 versions 12/7/2015–12/28/2015; suspended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Forced choice x2</td>
<td>Short</td>
<td>Mixed</td>
<td>Issues with 3 options</td>
<td>Return to two options 12/26/2015–12/29/2015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Forced choice x2</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Business, leadership</td>
<td>12/30/2015 review increased focus on ethics, business &amp; leadership; other feedback</td>
<td>3 versions based on feedback 12/31/2015–1/20/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Forced choice x2</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Business, leadership</td>
<td>Review and feedback from pilot organization</td>
<td>Pilot testing 1/20/2016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>Forced choice x2</td>
<td>Medium</td>
<td>Business, leadership</td>
<td>Academic and business feedback</td>
<td>8 versions based on feedback 1/21/2016–3/2/2016; consensus</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix H. Prompt Considerations for Virtue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Word</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Advantage</th>
<th>Disadvantage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Virtue</td>
<td>Exhibits virtue, acts with virtue, shows virtue, does what a virtuous manager would do</td>
<td>Fits with classical and some modern philosophy. Has a positive connotation with many managers. Is somewhat associated with honest, moral, honorable, and ethical.</td>
<td>Most managers may not know the classical sense. Has negative common connotation with some managers. Virtue is criticized by some modern philosophy. Word association ranks religious and incorruptible as closest matches. Has social desirability concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character</td>
<td>Exhibits character, acts with character, shows character, exhibits excellence of character</td>
<td>Associated with the classical sense of virtue in Greek philosophy. Not associated with religion. Positive connotation. Word association shows strongly associated with honorable and ethical.</td>
<td>Most managers may not know the classical sense. Character proved associated with a quirky personality. Has social desirability concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Word</td>
<td>Examples</td>
<td>Advantage</td>
<td>Disadvantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Honorable</td>
<td>Does what an honorable manager would do</td>
<td>From Chikeleze (2014). Associated with virtue. Connotation of deserving honor. Associated with admirable and ethical.</td>
<td>Honor could be deserved for reasons other than virtue (e.g., being caring). Pilot testing resulted in feedback that this prompt was also too strong. Associated with image management rather than character. Has social desirability concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exemplary</td>
<td>Does what an exemplary manager would to</td>
<td>Proved significant in the ELSQ. Associated with virtue. Connotation of deserving imitation. Associated with excellent and admirable</td>
<td>Imitation could be deserved for reasons other than virtue (e.g., being caring). Pilot testing resulted in feedback that this prompt was also too strong. Associated with image management. Has social desirability concerns. Not associated with ethical in word association.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The right</td>
<td>Does the right thing</td>
<td>Associates with virtue and the application of exemplary principles. Some managers strongly like.</td>
<td>Duty, justice, and caring could be considered “right.” Pilot testing resulted in feedback that this prompt was too strong. Feedback in use is that it implies any other answer is then “wrong.” Has social desirability concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>I would do what a good person would do.</td>
<td>Associates with virtue and the application of exemplary or honorable</td>
<td>Duty, justice, and caring could be considered “good.”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Word</td>
<td>Examples</td>
<td>Advantage</td>
<td>Disadvantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>principles. Has less social desirability concerns than identified alternative formations. Does not suffer from the word association issues and pilot testing concerns that other prompts suffer.</td>
<td>Broad and general in connotation. Pilot testing resulted in feedback that this prompt was less strong than honorable and exemplary. Has social desirability concerns.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix I. Prompt Considerations for Distributive Justice

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Prompt Version</th>
<th>Advantage</th>
<th>Disadvantage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Justice</td>
<td>Concerned about treating everyone fairly.</td>
<td>Proved significant in the ELSQ. Associated with justice.</td>
<td>Pilot testing resulted in feedback that this prompt was confusing—“fair to whom?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Justice</td>
<td>Do what is best for being fair.</td>
<td>Adapted from the ELSQ. Associated with justice. Best adds a note of optimality.</td>
<td>Pilot testing resulted in feedback that this prompt was confusing—“fair to whom?”</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Justice</td>
<td>Is equitable to others, treating everyone equally.</td>
<td>Associated with justice and egalitarianism.</td>
<td>Pilot testing resulted in feedback that this prompt was confusing both in reference to whom is addressed and the notion of being equitable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Justice</td>
<td>Act with justice.</td>
<td>Directly associated with justice by name.</td>
<td>Pilot testing resulted in feedback that this prompt was confusing both in reference to whom is addressed and in the different notions of justice.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Justice</td>
<td>I would do what is fair.</td>
<td>Adapted from the ELSQ. Associated with justice. Simpler and more colloquial than notions of being equitable and just.</td>
<td>Pilot testing resulted in feedback that this prompt was confusing—“fair to whom?”—however no more so than the alternative prompts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix J: Prompt Considerations for Duty

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Prompt Version</th>
<th>Advantage</th>
<th>Disadvantage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Duty</td>
<td>Fulfilling my obligations as leader in charge.</td>
<td>Proved significant in the ELSQ. Puts emphasis on leadership role.</td>
<td>Oblige has connotation of constraint. Pilot testing resulted in feedback that obligations were considered more negatively than duties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Puts emphasis on leadership role in a way the other prompts do not.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duty</td>
<td>Fulfills obligations.</td>
<td>Similar to the prompt that proved significant in the ELSQ.</td>
<td>Oblige has connotation of constraint. Pilot testing resulted in feedback that obligations were considered more negatively than duties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duty</td>
<td>Creates a participative and open work environment because she believes that every employee has a right to be heard.</td>
<td>From Chikeleze (2014). Connects participation, environment, and employee rights.</td>
<td>Pilot testing resulted in feedback that this prompt was awkward and too specific in formulation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>I would do what is best for fulfilling my responsibilities.</td>
<td>Has connotation of duty, requirement, or expectation.</td>
<td>Does not have connotation of relation to position. Use of best in this prompt intensifies it if best is not used in other prompts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duty</td>
<td>Meet responsibilities.</td>
<td>Has connotation of duty, requirement, or expectation.</td>
<td>Does not have denotation of relation to position.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style</td>
<td>Prompt Version</td>
<td>Advantage</td>
<td>Disadvantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duty</td>
<td>I would do my duty.</td>
<td>Directly associated with duty by name.</td>
<td>Does not contain as much explanatory denotation as other longer formulations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Has connotation of relation to position.</td>
<td>Proliferating denotion as other longer formulations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pilot testing resulted in feedback that</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>duty as a prompt is simple and clear.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pilot testing resulted in feedback that duty as a prompt is simple and clear.
## Appendix K: Prompt Considerations for Utilitarianism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Prompt Version</th>
<th>Advantage</th>
<th>Disadvantage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Utilitarianism</td>
<td>Making sure more people benefitted by the outcome than were hurt by it.</td>
<td>Used in the ELSQ.</td>
<td>Did not prove significant in ELSQ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Includes the notion of considering both benefits and hurts.</td>
<td>Benefits and hurts are not fully complementary conceptually.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Is close to the core concepts of utilitarianism.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilitarianism</td>
<td>Helps the most people overall.</td>
<td>Is simpler.</td>
<td>Pilot testing resulted in feedback that this prompt formulation is confused with caring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Is positive.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilitarianism</td>
<td>Works to create the greatest good for the greatest number.</td>
<td>Is close to the core concepts of utilitarianism.</td>
<td>Pilot testing resulted in feedback that this prompt formulation is conceptually challenging.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilitarianism</td>
<td>I would do what is best for the most people.</td>
<td>Is close to the core concepts of utilitarianism</td>
<td>Can be confused with other prompts as best could refer to the most just or most caring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilitarianism</td>
<td>I would do what benefits the most people.</td>
<td>Is associated with utilitarianism.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Pilot testing resulted in feedback that this prompt is simple and clear.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Is not as close to the core concepts of utilitarianism as some other concepts.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix L: Prompt Considerations for Caring

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Prompt Version</th>
<th>Advantage</th>
<th>Disadvantage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>Determining how this situation would affect my close work relationships.</td>
<td>Used in ELSQ.</td>
<td>Did not prove significant in ELSQ.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Includes a focus on close relationships.</td>
<td>Emphasizes the situation and the work dimensions in a way that other prompts may not.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Distinguishes generic relationships and close relationships.</td>
<td>Does not include the notion of care or caring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>I would do what is best for my close relationships.</td>
<td>Distinguishes generic relationships and close relationships.</td>
<td>Does not include the notion of care or caring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>I would do what is best for my relationships.</td>
<td>Explicitly includes relationships.</td>
<td>Does not include the notion of care or caring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Does not distinguish generic relationships and close relationships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>I would care for my close relationships.</td>
<td>Explicitly includes care and relationships.</td>
<td>Does not explicitly include sensitivity or responsiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Builds and maintains caring relationships.</td>
<td>Explicitly includes caring.</td>
<td>Does not explicitly include sensitivity or responsiveness.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Explicitly includes relationships.</td>
<td>Does not distinguish generic relationships and close relationships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Includes the denotation of relationship building.</td>
<td>Lacks an explicit notion of building and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style</td>
<td>Prompt Version</td>
<td>Advantage</td>
<td>Disadvantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>I would be sensitive to the needs of others:</td>
<td>Includes sensitivity to needs which is an important dimension of caring in some philosophies of caring.</td>
<td>Does not explicitly include caring, relationships, or responsiveness. Lacks an explicit notion of building and maintaining relationships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Is responsive to the needs of others.</td>
<td>Includes responsiveness to needs which is an important dimension of caring in some philosophies of caring.</td>
<td>Does not explicitly include caring, relationships, or sensitivity. Lacks an explicit notion of building and maintaining relationships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>I would be sensitive and caring in my close relationships.</td>
<td>Includes sensitivity to needs which is an important dimension of caring in some philosophies of caring. Explicitly includes caring and relationships.</td>
<td>Is long compared to the other prompts. Does not include responsiveness, which is an important dimension of caring in some philosophies of caring.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Distinguishes generic relationships and close relationships.</td>
<td>Lacks an explicit notion of building and maintaining relationships.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Appendix M: Prompt Considerations for Egoism

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Style</th>
<th>Prompt Version</th>
<th>Advantage</th>
<th>Disadvantage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Egoism</td>
<td>Making sure my own goals as leader are satisfied.</td>
<td>Included in ELSQ. Explicitly includes notion of being leader. Focus on goals may lessen social desirability concerns.</td>
<td>Did not prove significant in ELSQ. Reference to leader may be seen as excluding personal concerns. Goals may refer to being just or doing one’s duty or some other prompt. Has social desirability concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egoism</td>
<td>I would do what is best for achieving my goals.</td>
<td>Included in ELSQ. Explicitly includes notion of being leader. Focus on goals may lessen social desirability concerns.</td>
<td>Did not prove significant in ELSQ. Reference to leader may be seen as excluding some personal concerns properly part of egoism. Goals may refer to being just or doing one’s duty or some other prompt. Has social desirability concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egoism</td>
<td>I would focus on advancing my career.</td>
<td>Career may be considered a legitimate concern with less of a social desirability concern than other prompts.</td>
<td>Reference to career may be seen as excluding some personal concerns properly part of egoism. Does not describe the core essence of egoism. Has social desirability concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Style</td>
<td>Prompt Version</td>
<td>Advantage</td>
<td>Disadvantage</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egoism</td>
<td>I would act in my self-interest.</td>
<td>Pilot tests as simple and clear.</td>
<td>Pilot testing resulted in feedback that this prompt formulation has strong</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clearly describes the core essence of egoism.</td>
<td>social desirability concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egoism</td>
<td>I would do what is in my best interest.</td>
<td>Pilot tests as simple and clear.</td>
<td>Pilot testing resulted in feedback that this prompt formulation has social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Describes the core essence of egoism.</td>
<td>desirability concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The positivity of benefits may lessen social desirability concerns.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egoism</td>
<td>I would do what benefits me the most.</td>
<td>Pilot tests as simple and clear.</td>
<td>Pilot testing resulted in feedback that this prompt formulation has social</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Describes the core essence of egoism.</td>
<td>desirability concerns.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>The positivity of benefits may lessen social desirability concerns.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Parallels the construction of the utilitarianism prompt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix N: Prompt Iterations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Virtue</td>
<td>Doing what an exemplary leader would do in the situation.</td>
<td>I would do what an exemplary leader should do in this situation.</td>
<td>I would do what is best for building my character.</td>
<td>I would do what a good person would do.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Justice</td>
<td>Treating everyone fairly.</td>
<td>I would do what is fair.</td>
<td>I would do what is fair.</td>
<td>I would do what is fair.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duty</td>
<td>Fulfilling my obligations as the leader-in-charge.</td>
<td>I would do what is best in fulfilling my responsibilities.</td>
<td>I would do what is best for fulfilling my responsibilities.</td>
<td>I would do my duty.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilitarian</td>
<td>Making sure that more people benefited by the outcome, than were hurt by it.</td>
<td>I would do what is best for the most people.</td>
<td>I would do what is best for the most people.</td>
<td>I would do what benefits the most people.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>Determining how this situation could affect my close work relationships.</td>
<td>I would do what is best for my relationships.</td>
<td>I would do what is best for my close relationships.</td>
<td>I would be sensitive and caring in my close relationships.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egoism</td>
<td>Making sure my own goals as leader are satisfied.</td>
<td>I would do what is in my best interest.</td>
<td>I would do what is best for achieving my goals.</td>
<td>I would do what benefits me the most.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Appendix O: Style Selection Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Virtue</th>
<th>Justice</th>
<th>Duty</th>
<th>Utility</th>
<th>Care</th>
<th>Egoism</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>106</td>
<td>106</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>3.623</td>
<td>3.557</td>
<td>2.865</td>
<td>2.091</td>
<td>1.821</td>
<td>1.044</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Median</td>
<td>3.667</td>
<td>3.667</td>
<td>2.667</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>1.667</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Deviation</td>
<td>0.964</td>
<td>0.676</td>
<td>0.870</td>
<td>0.683</td>
<td>0.758</td>
<td>0.793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>-0.675</td>
<td>-0.224</td>
<td>0.361</td>
<td>-0.114</td>
<td>-0.034</td>
<td>0.537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Error of Skewness</td>
<td>0.235</td>
<td>0.235</td>
<td>0.235</td>
<td>0.235</td>
<td>0.235</td>
<td>0.235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z Skewedness</td>
<td>-2.872*</td>
<td>-0.953</td>
<td>1.536</td>
<td>-0.485</td>
<td>-0.145</td>
<td>2.285*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>0.462</td>
<td>-0.148</td>
<td>-0.356</td>
<td>0.541</td>
<td>-0.352</td>
<td>-0.704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Error of Kurtosis</td>
<td>0.465</td>
<td>0.465</td>
<td>0.465</td>
<td>0.465</td>
<td>0.465</td>
<td>0.465</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z Kurtosis</td>
<td>0.997</td>
<td>-0.564</td>
<td>-0.875</td>
<td>1.079</td>
<td>-0.870</td>
<td>-1.230</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>0.333</td>
<td>1.667</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>3.333</td>
<td>3.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 Percentile</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>2.333</td>
<td>1.667</td>
<td>1.333</td>
<td>0.333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50 Percentile</td>
<td>3.667</td>
<td>3.667</td>
<td>2.667</td>
<td>2.000</td>
<td>1.667</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 Percentile</td>
<td>4.333</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>3.333</td>
<td>2.417</td>
<td>2.333</td>
<td>1.667</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant (magnitude in excess of 1.97)
## Appendix P: Correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Virtue</th>
<th>Distributive Justice</th>
<th>Duty</th>
<th>Utilitarianism</th>
<th>Caring</th>
<th>Ego</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Virtue</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.133</td>
<td>-0.394**</td>
<td>-0.294**</td>
<td>0.099</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (1-tailed)</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.156</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Distributive Justice</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-0.133</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.123</td>
<td>-0.175*</td>
<td>-0.142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (1-tailed)</td>
<td>0.088</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duty</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-0.394**</td>
<td>-0.123</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.025</td>
<td>-0.453**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (1-tailed)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.105</td>
<td>0.398</td>
<td>0.275</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilitarianism</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-0.294**</td>
<td>-0.175*</td>
<td>-0.025</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>-0.385**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (1-tailed)</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>0.036</td>
<td>0.398</td>
<td>0.337</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caring</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td>-0.142</td>
<td>-0.453**</td>
<td>-0.385**</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (1-tailed)</td>
<td>0.156</td>
<td>0.073</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Egoism</td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>-0.511**</td>
<td>-0.269**</td>
<td>-0.059</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>-0.126</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (1-tailed)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td>0.275</td>
<td>0.337</td>
<td>0.099</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).**

*Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (1-tailed).
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