

## **Best Practice of Ethical Leadership among the Academic Administrators in Islamic Tertiary Education Institution: Academic Staff's Perceptions**

Assoc Prof Dr Mohamad Johdi Salleh, & Zenita Arryani Tiyunin

<sup>1,2</sup> *International Islamic University Malaysia (IIUM)*

---

**Abstract:** *The purpose of the study is to investigate the best practice of Ethical Leadership among the academic administrators in Islamic Tertiary Education Institution as perceived by academic staff. This study is using a validated questionnaire that was developed by Kalshoven, Den Hartog & De Hoogh known as "Ethical Leadership at Work Questionnaire" (ELW). It is to measure the seven dimensions of ethical leader behaviour which comprises of ethical leadership scale, namely, fairness, integrity, ethical guidance, people orientation, power sharing, role clarification and concern for sustainability (Kalshoven, et al., 2011). The study involved 262 academic staffs from several kulliyahs and centres of the International Islamic University Malaysia (IIUM), Kuala Lumpur. The data collected from the survey were analysed using the Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS) version 20.0. The result of the study shows that 'role clarification' has the highest mean score of 3.73, followed by 'integrity' with mean score 3.60, and, third highest scored practiced by the academic administrators was 'concern for sustainability' with mean 3.42. It is hoped that the findings in this study will contribute and encourage the tertiary education institution to improve further in its organization especially which is related to the academic administrators' practice on ethical leadership behaviour. The impact will be huge throughout the world as can be seen as a world class university striving towards the vision and mission in enhancing the quality ummah in the era of globalization.*

**Keywords:** *best practice - ethical leadership – academic administrators*

---

### **I. INTRODUCTION**

An outstanding ethical leadership behaviour practiced by the academic administrators towards the staff, students and society is vital in ensuring the positive impact of the organization. The excellent academic administrators practising ethical leadership would enhance the trust in people towards the organizations or institutions. It is believed that quality academic administrators practising ethical leadership behaviour will lead to tremendous benefits of mankind as a whole that may amplify the name of institution in the global world. Moreover, the effective practice of ethical leadership by leaders and administrative staff may tremendously increase the momentum of achieving the vision and mission of organization including the tertiary educational institutions.

### **II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

Ethical leadership or Ethics normally been used interchangeably with moral. In general terms, ethics can be explained as what people's action should be. It is actually trying to give us guidelines on how we are supposed to act. While moral is actually what people are doing. It can also be seen as a set of moral standard of what is a good behaviour and what is a bad behaviour (Brown & Mitchell, 2010).

Resick, Hanges, Dickson & Mitchelson (2006) mentioned, the ethical leadership includes the activities of leading, planning, organizing and controlling the organization with rights, just, respects and dignity of others. It can also be explained as study of stands that determine a good and a bad behaviour and a right and wrong choice.

Toor & Ofori (2009) admit that ethical leadership plays an important role in the organization as well as the people in the organization. Their research findings showed that those leaders who practiced ethical leadership will encourage the people to give full support and give satisfaction to the people. This will lead to a positive impact to the organization (Schminke et. al., 2007). Clarkson (2009) suggested that a leader must act with integrity so that the organization can gain the goodness of the leadership.

Knowing the society is becoming more demanding on ethical leadership, thus, a Muslim leader must serve God, means to act according to God and Prophet's instruction and inculcate the Islamic moral character in their daily life. This is clearly stated in the Al-Quran:

“O you who believe! Stand out firmly for Allâh as just witnesses and let not the enmity and hatred of others make you avoid justice. Be just: that is nearer to piety, and fear Allâh. Verily, Allâh is Well-Acquainted with what you do.” (Surah Al-Maidah, verse 8).

This moral character is reflected through four stages of spiritual development: Iman, Islam, taqwa and Ihsan where Islam do recognise the practice of power in performing the task but it has to be used with etiquette (Rafik & Jamal, 1999). As Clarkson (2009) said, a leader must act with integrity so that the organization can gain the goodness of the leadership.

At the present, Indonesia and Malaysia, which have the highest number of Muslims population are directly or indirectly portrayed the image of Islam. Any unjust, discrimination, negligence, and, corrupted Muslims especially leaders in any organization and most importantly, in higher learning institution, where the institution is teaching the future generation to become a leader, are not acceptable because leadership in Islam is considered as a trust or amanah as khalifah or vicegerent of Allah. It is reminded in the Al-Quran:

“And by the Mercy of Allâh, you dealt with them gently. And had you been severe and harsh-hearted, they would have broken away from about you; so pass over (their faults), and ask (Allâh's) Forgiveness for them; and consult them in the affairs. Then when you have taken a decision, put your trust in Allâh, certainly, Allâh loves those who put their trust (in Him). (Surah Al-Imran, verse 159).

Leaders and managers especially Muslims in an organization or higher learning institution should behave ethically and manifest the Islamic principles in their management. The ethical leadership is becoming more demanded not only at the organizational level, but also at the individual level. Reforming an organization presents leaders to face great challenges ahead. They must defeat the moral and psychological concern of organization members who are habituated to the conservative and backward ways. Muslim leaders must have clear ideas on Islamic principles and understand their roles in organizations to lead excellently, transformative, and innovatively. Abbasi, et al. (2010) stated that ethical leadership aspects are related to positive character, honesty, integrity, altruism, trustworthiness, collective motivation, encouragement and justice in leader's characteristic. In that case, leaders must be ethical as it will generate ethical environment in the organization and the society will look at the organization as an organization that can be trusted (Toor & Ofori, 2009; McManus, 2011).

It is the leader who will be responsible and accountable in bringing values and ethics in the organization or institution. Research by Brown & Trevino (2006) has shown that ethical leadership is popular. However, most people pay more attention and remember unethical leadership. That is why, in order to make ethical leadership well known to most people and effective, leaders must be consistent and proactive in implementing ethical leadership in their daily duties both inside and outside their organization. The perception that people has ethical leaders are justice, honest, trustworthy, fair, principled decision makers who care about the people around them as well as the society.

“O you who believe! Stand out firmly for justice, as witnesses to Allâh, even though it be against yourselves, or your parents, or your kin, be he rich or poor, Allâh is a Better Protector to both (than you). So follow not the lusts (of your hearts), lest you avoid justice, and if you distort your witness or refuse to give it, verily, Allâh is Ever Well-Acquainted with what you do”. (Surah An-Nisa, verse 135).

The above statement encourages leaders and individuals to act ethically in their personal and professional lives to sustain trust and performance of leadership and organizational productivity.

According to Azuka (2001), ethical behaviour is usually associated with the interest where it is connected to the moral principles when making decision especially in difficult situation. Therefore, to become a leader with integrity is difficult as it is full of hurdles, obstacles and challenges. However, the impact of ethical leadership will be felt even when the leader has long left the organization. White & Lean (2008) anticipate that in order to be perceived as an effective leader, the followers or the subordinates must consider the leader to be having integrity that is in line with the followers' or subordinates' expectations.

Meanwhile, Islam strongly suggested that leaders should practice their leadership styles and approaches with optimum sincerity, integrity, fairness, honest, caring, sharing, and, high wisdom or hikmah as to be appreciated full-heartedly. These principles of ethical leadership were effectively practiced by prominent Muslim leaders such as Khalifah Abu Bakar As-Siddiq, Umar Al-Khattab, Uthman Ibn Affan, Ali Abu Talib, Umar Abdul Aziz and Solehuddin Al-Ayubi who were highly respected and favorably appreciated by subordinates, supporters and rivals until the present days.

It is clear that the practices of ethical leadership have great impact on individuals, organizations, institutions, and, all mankind.

Truthfully, these facts and figures have inspired and motivated the researcher to conduct a study on ethical leadership particularly in tertiary education institution. The study aims to investigate if the academic administrators in IIUM are practising ethical leadership while performing their daily duties. This can help in identifying the ethical leadership best practice that may be utilized for future improvement and enhancement of IIUM, most likely to the world class university.

### III. OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

The main objective of the study is to identify best practice of ethical leadership among academic administrators as perceived by academic staffs at the International Islamic University Malaysia Kuala Lumpur.

### IV. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This research is using a validated questionnaire that was developed by Kalshoven, Den Hartog & De Hoogh (2010, 2011) known as "Ethical Leadership at Work Questionnaire" (ELW). The distributions of the survey questionnaire were fully assisted by the Assistant Directors of every Kulliyah or Faculty. The study involved 262 respondents comprises of academic staffs including Professors, Associate Professors, Assistant Professors, Doctors, and, Lecturers. They were from the Kulliyah of Architecture, Kulliyah of Economics & Management Sciences, Kulliyah of Education, Kulliyah of Engineering, Kulliyah of Islamic Revealed Knowledge and Human Sciences, Kulliyah of Information, Communication and Technology as well as Ahmad Ibrahim Kulliyah of Laws, International Islamic University Malaysia (IIUM), Gombak Kuala Lumpur. They were requested to answer thirty eight items that measure the seven dimensions namely, (1) PO- people orientation, (2) F- fairness, (3) PS- power sharing, (4) CS- concern for sustainability, (5) EG- ethical guidance, (6) RC- role clarification and (7) I- integrity. Their responses were measured according to a five (5)-point Likert Scale ranging from "1-Strongly Disagree" to "5-Strongly Agree". The data collected from the survey were analysed using the Statistical Package for the Social Science (SPSS) version 20.0.

### V. Analysis of Data

The perceptions of academic staff on the academic administrators' practice on ethical leadership had been analysed using the descriptive analysis. This is to reveal the perceptions of the academic staffs on the academic administrators' best practice on ethical leadership. The findings are presented in frequency, percentage, mean, and, standard deviation.

#### 5.1 Academic Staff's Perception on the Practice of Ethical Leadership among the Academic Administrators in IIUM

Table 1 described the academic staff perception on the practice of ethical leadership among the academic administrators in IIUM from the perspective of "People Orientation".

The highest score for PO was extracted from the statement "Academic administrator cares about his/her followers" which indicated that 115 respondents (43.9%) selected "Agree" and 6 respondents (2.3%) selected "Disagree", 23 respondents (8.8%) selected "Strongly Disagree", while 89 respondents (34%) selected "Neutral" and 29 respondents (11.1%) selected "Strongly Agree. The mean score of the below statement was 3.46 with a standard deviation 1.023.

**Table 1:** Academic staff's perception on the practice of Ethical Leadership among the academic administrators in IIUM on People Orientation - PO (N=262)

No	Items	Score, Frequency & Percentage					Mean	SD
		1	2	3	4	5		
1.	Academic administrator is interested in how I feel and how I am doing	35 (13.4)	59 (22.5)	25 (9.5)	125 (47.7)	18 (6.9)	3.12	1.22
2.	Academic administrator takes time for personal contact	11 (4.2)	56 (21.4)	71 (27.1)	94 (35.9)	30 (11.5)	3.29	1.06
3.	Academic administrator pays attention to personal needs	34 (13)	36 (13.7)	111 (42.4)	63 (24)	18 (6.9)	2.98	1.08
4.	Academic administrator takes time to talk about work-related emotions	48 (18.3)	48 (18.3)	89 (34)	73 (27.9)	4 (1.5)	2.76	1.09
5.	Academic administrator is genuinely concerned about my personal development	35 (13.4)	84 (32.1)	73 (27.9)	51 (19.5)	19 (7.3)	2.75	1.13
6.	Academic administrator sympathizes with me when I have problems	24 (9.2)	15 (5.7)	101 (38.5)	86 (32.8)	36 (13.7)	3.36	1.08
7.	Academic administrator cares about his/her followers	23 (8.8)	6 (2.3)	89 (34)	115 (43.9)	29 (11.1)	3.46	1.02
Sub-total (Average)							3.10	0.84

Note: SD = Standard Deviation, f = Frequency, (number) = (%)

Score- 1= Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neutral, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly agree

On the other hand, the lowest score of PO was extracted from the statement “Academic administrator is genuinely concerned about my personal development”. In response to the statement, most of the surveyed indicated that a majority of the respondents, 84 respondents selected “Disagree” that contributed to 32.1% to the result. Other responses to this statement included 35 respondents selected “Strongly Disagree” that contributed to 13.4%, 73 respondents selected “Neutral” that contributed to 27.9%, 51 respondents selected “Agree” that contributed to 19.5% and last, 19 respondents selected “Strongly Agree” that contributed to 7.3%. So, the overall results for the below statement were 2.75 with a standard deviation of 1.13.

**5.2 Academic staff’s perception on the practice of Ethical Leadership among the academic administrators in IIUM on Fairness - F**

Table 2 described the academic staff perception on the practice of ethical leadership among the academic administrators in IIUM from the perspective of “Fairness”.

The highest score for F was from the statement “Academic administrator is focused mainly on reaching his / her own goals”, which indicated that 84 respondents (32.1%) selected “Neutral” and 12 respondents (4.6%) selected “Strongly Agree”, 43 respondents (16.4%) selected “Strongly Disagree”, 59 respondents (22.5%) selected “Disagree” and 64 respondents (24.4%) selected “Agree”. The mean score for the below statement was 2.78 with a standard deviation 1.12.

**Table 2:** Academic staff’s perception on the practice of Ethical Leadership among the academic administrators in IIUM on Fairness – F (N=262)

No	Items	Score, Frequency & Percentage					Mean	SD
		1	2	3	4	5		
1.	Academic administrator holds me accountable for problems over which I have no control	44 (16.8)	76 (29)	74 (28.2)	45 (17.2)	23 (8.8)	2.72	1.18
2.	Academic administrator holds me responsible for work that I have no control over	43 (16.4)	96 (36.6)	42 (16)	57 (21.8)	24 (9.2)	2.71	1.24
3.	Academic administrator holds me responsible for things that are not my fault	86 (32.8)	55 (21)	66 (25.2)	32 (12.2)	23 (8.8)	2.43	1.30
4.	Academic administrator pursues his / her own success at the expense of others.	43 (16.4)	113 (43.1)	76 (29)	18 (6.9)	12 (4.6)	2.40	0.99
5.	Academic administrator is focused mainly on reaching his / her own goals	43 (16.4)	59 (22.5)	84 (32.1)	64 (24.4)	12 (4.6)	2.78	1.13
6.	Academic Administrator manipulates subordinates	44 (16.8)	103 (39.3)	76 (29)	39 (14.9)	0 (0)	2.42	0.94
Sub-total (Average)							2.58	1.02

Note: SD = Standard Deviation, f = Frequency, (number) = (%)  
Score- 1= Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neutral, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly agree

On the other hand, the lowest score for F was extracted from the statement “Academic administrator pursues his / her own success at the expense of others”. The results of this statement showed that 113 respondents selected “Disagree” with 43.1% contributions to the result obtained. While 12 respondents selected “Strongly Agree” with only 4.6%. Meanwhile, 42 respondents selected “Strongly Disagree” with 16.4% contribution to the results, 76 respondents selected “Neutral” with 29% contribution to the results and 18 respondents selected “Agree” with 6.9% contribution to the results. The mean score for the below statement was 2.40 with a standard deviation 0.99.

**5.3 Academic staff’s perception on the practice of Ethical Leadership among the academic administrators in IIUM on Power Sharing - PS**

Table 3 described academic staff’s perception on the practice of ethical leadership among academic administrators in IIUM from the perspective of “Power Sharing”.

The highest score for PS was from the statement “Academic administrator will reconsider decisions on the basis of recommendations by those who report to him / her” where over half that is 63.4% indicated “Agree” with 166 respondents selected the statement. A minority of respondents i.e. 6.1% indicated “Disagree” i.e. 54 respondents selected “Neutral” that contributed to 20.6% of the results and 26 respondents selected “Strongly Agree” that contributed to 9.9% of the results. The mean score for the below statement was 3.77 with a standard deviation 0.71.

**Table 3:** Academic staff’s perception on the practice of Ethical Leadership among the academic administrators in IIUM on Power Sharing – PS (N=262)

No	Items	Score, Frequency & Percentage					Mean	SD
		1	2	3	4	5		
1.	Academic administrator allows subordinates to influence critical decision	27 (10.3%)	50 (19.1%)	98 (37.4)	62 (23.7)	25 (9.5%)	3.03	1.12
2.	Academic administrator does not allow other to participate in decision making	67 (25.6)	84 (32.1)	71 (27.1)	17 (6.5)	23 (8.8)	2.41	1.19
3.	Academic administrator seeks advice from subordinates concerning organizational strategy	12 (4.6)	28 (10.7)	30 (11.5)	163 (62.2)	29 (11.1)	3.65	0.97
4.	Academic administrator will reconsider decisions on the basis of recommendations by those who report to him / her		16 (6.1)	54 (20.6)	166 (63.4)	26 (9.9)	3.77	0.71
5.	Academic administrator Delegates challenging responsibilities to subordinates		14 (5.3)	81 (30.9)	129 (49.2)	38 (14.5)	3.73	0.77
6.	Academic administrator permits me to play a key role in setting my own performance goals	24 (9.2)	2 (0.8)	49 (18.7)	155 (59.2)	32 (12.2)	3.65	1.02
Sub-total (Average)							3.37	0.58

Note: SD = Standard Deviation, f = Frequency, (number) = (%)

Score- 1= Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neutral, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly agree

On the other hand, the lowest score for PS was extracted from the statement “Academic administrator does not allow other to participate in decision making”, where below half i.e. 32.1% indicated “Disagree” with 84 respondents and some 27.1% selected “Neutral” with 71 respondents. But, 67 respondents (25.6%) indicated “Strongly Disagree”, 23 respondents (8.8%) indicated “Strongly Agree” and 17 respondents selected “Agree” that indicated 17%. In addition, the mean score for the above statement was 2.41 with a standard deviation of 1.19.

#### 5.4 Academic staff’s perception on the practice of Ethical Leadership among the academic administrators in IIUM on Concern for Sustainability - CS

Table 4 described academic staff’s perception on the practice of ethical leadership among academic administrators in IIUM from the perspective of “Concern for Sustainability”.

The highest score for CS was from the statement “Academic administrator would like to work in an environmentally friendly manner”. It is interesting to note that in this statement, 172 respondents chose “Agree” which contributed 65.6% of the results. Whereby, 12 respondents chose “Strongly Disagree” that contributed to 4.6% of the results. In addition, 60 respondents chose “Neutral” that contributed 22.9% and 18 respondents chose “Strongly Agree” that contributed to 6.9%. The mean score for the below statement was 3.70 with a standard deviation of 0.79.

**Table 4:** Academic staff's perception on the practice of Ethical Leadership among the academic administrators in IIUM on Concern for Sustainability – CS (N=262)

No	Items	Score, Frequency & Percentage					Mean	SD
		1	2	3	4	5		
1.	Academic administrator would like to work in an environmentally friendly manner	12 (4.6)		60 (22.9)	172 (65.6)	18 (6.9)	3.70	0.79
2.	Academic administrator shows concern for sustainability issues	11 (4.2)	31 (11.8)	52 (19.8)	163 (62.2)	5 (1.9)	3.46	0.88
3.	Academic administrator stimulates recycling of items and materials in our department	25 (9.5)	45 (17.2)	99 (37.8)	66 (25.2)	27 (10.3)	3.10	1.10
Sub-total (Average)							1.10	0.58

Note: SD = Standard Deviation, f = Frequency, (number) = (%)  
 Score- 1= Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neutral, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly agree

On the other hand, the lowest score for CS was extracted from the statement “Academic administrator stimulates recycling of items and materials in our department”. It showed that 37.8% selected “Neutral” with 99 respondents while another 9.5% selected “Strongly Disagree” with 25 respondents. In addition, 66 respondents chose “Agree” that contributed to 25.2% of the results, 45 respondents chose “Disagree” that contributed to 17.2% of the results and 27 respondents chose “Strongly Agree” that contributed to 10.3% of the results. This indicated the mean score of 3.10 with a standard deviation of 1.10.

### 5.5 Academic staff's perception on the practice of Ethical Leadership among the academic administrators in IIUM on Ethical Guidance - EG

Table 5 described academic staff's perception on the practice of ethical leadership among academic administrators in IIUM from the perspective of “Ethical Guidance”.

The highest score for EG was from the statement “Academic administrator compliments employees who behave according to the integrity guidelines”. 149 respondents i.e. 56.9% chose “Agree” while 14 respondents chose “Disagree” with 5.3% contributed to the results. 59 respondents (22.5%) selected “Neutral”, 23 respondents (8.8%) selected “Strongly Disagree” and 17 respondents (6.5%) selected “Strongly Agree”. The mean score for the below statement was 3.47 with a standard deviation of 1.01.

**Table 5:** Academic staff's perception on the practice of Ethical Leadership among the academic administrators in IIUM on Ethical Guidance – EG (N=262)

No	Items	Score, Frequency & Percentage					Mean	SD
		1	2	3	4	5		
1.	Academic administrator clearly explains integrity related codes of conduct.	37 (14.1)	12 (4.6)	63 (24)	132 (50.4)	18 (6.9)	3.31	1.14
2.	Academic administrator explains what is expected from employees in term of behaving with integrity	23 (8.8)	26 (9.9)	32 (12.2)	177 (67.6)	4 (1.5)	3.43	1.00
3.	Academic administrator clarifies integrity guidelines	34 (13)	27 (10.3)	60 (22.9)	137 (52.3)	4 (1.5)	3.19	1.08
4.	Academic administrator ensures that employees follow codes of integrity	23 (8.8)	14 (5.3)	53 (20.2)	167 (63.7)	5 (1.9)	3.45	0.96
5.	Academic administrator clarifies the likely consequences of possible unethical behaviour by myself or my colleagues	24 (9.2)	27 (10.3)	79 (30.2)	128 (48.9)	4 (1.5)	3.23	0.98
6.	Academic administrator stimulates the discussion of integrity issues among employees	23 (8.8)	39 (49)	69 (26.3)	115 (43.9)	15 (5.7)	3.23	1.06
7.	Academic administrator compliments employees who behave according to the integrity guidelines	23 (8.8)	14 (5.3)	59 (22.5)	149 (56.9)	17 (6.5)	3.47	1.01
Sub-total (Average)							3.33	0.93

Note: SD = Standard Deviation, f = Frequency, (number) = (%)  
 Score- 1= Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neutral, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly agree

On the other hand, the lowest score for EG was extracted from the statement “Academic administrator clarifies integrity guidelines”, where over half i.e. 52.3% indicated “Agree” with 137 respondents selected the statement. A minority of respondents i.e. 1.5% indicated “Strongly Agree” with 4 respondents and 22.9% chose “Neutral” with 60 respondents. But 34 of the respondents (13%) indicated “Strongly Disagree” and 27 respondents selected “Disagree” that indicated 10.3%. In addition, the mean score for the below statement was 3.19 with a standard deviation of 1.08.

**5.6 Academic Staff’s perception on the practice of Ethical Leadership among the academic administrators in IIUM on Role Clarification - RC**

Table 6 described academic staff’s perception on the practice of ethical leadership among academic administrators in IIUM from the perspective of “Role Clarification” (RC).

The highest score for RC was from the statement “Academic administrator explains what is expected of me and my colleagues.” It is interesting to note that in this statement, 163 respondents chose “Agree” which contributed 62.2% of the results. In addition, 12 respondents chose “Strongly Disagree” and “Disagree” respectively that contributed the same percentage of 4.6% for each result. While 46 respondents chose “Strongly Agree” which contributed 17.6% of the results and 29 respondents chose “Neutral” which contributed 11.1% of the results. The mean score for the below statement was 3.78 with a standard deviation of 0.85.

**Table 6:** Academic Staff’s perception on the practice of Ethical Leadership among the academic administrators in IIUM on Role Clarification – RC (N=262)

No	Items	Score, Frequency & Percentage					Mean	SD
		1	2	3	4	5		
1.	Academic administrator indicates what the performance expectations of each group members are	12 (4.6)	11 (4.2)	55 (21)	141 (53.8)	43 (16.4)	3.73	0.94
2.	Academic administrator explains what is expected of each group member	13 (5)	11 (4.2)	45 (17.2)	159 (60.7)	34 (13)	3.73	0.92
3.	Academic administrator explains what is expected of me and my colleagues	12 (4.6)	12 (4.6)	29 (11.1)	163 (62.2)	46 (17.6)	3.84	0.93
4.	Academic administrator clarifies priorities	26 (9.9)	22 (8.4)	16 (6.1)	168 (64.1)	30 (11.5)	3.59	1.11
5.	Academic administrator clarifies who is responsible for what	13 (5)	3 (1.1)	43 (16.4)	173 (66)	30 (11.5)	3.78	0.85
Sub-total (Average)							3.73	0.81

Note: SD = Standard Deviation, f = Frequency, (number) = (%)  
 Score- 1= Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neutral, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly agree

On the other hand, the lowest score for RC was extracted from the statement “Academic administrator clarifies priorities” that was positively rated among the respondents. It showed that 64.1% selected “Agree” with 168 respondents while 11.5% selected “Strongly Agree”, 9.9% selected “Strongly Disagree” with 26 respondents, 8.4% selected “Disagree” with 22 respondents and 6.1% selected “Neutral” with 16 respondents. In addition, it indicated the mean score of 3.59 with a standard deviation of 1.11.

**5.7 Academic staff’s perception on the practice of Ethical Leadership among the academic administrators in IIUM on Integrity – I**

Table 7 described academic staff’s perception on the practice of ethical leadership among academic administrators in IIUM from the perspective of “Integrity”.

The highest score for I was the statement “Academic administrator can be trusted to do the things he / she says” which resulted in 177 respondents who selected “Agree” that contributed to 67.6% and 28 respondents selected “Strongly Agree” with 10.7%. While 27 respondents with 10.3% chose “Neutral”. However, 18 respondents (6.9%) chose “Disagree” and 12 respondents (4.6%) chose “Strongly Disagree”. As a result, the mean score and standard deviation for the statement indicated 3.73 and 0.91.

**Table 7:** Academic staff's perception on the practice of Ethical Leadership among the academic administrators in IIUM on Integrity – I (N=262)

No	Items	Score, Frequency & Percentage					Mean	SD
		1	2	3	4	5		
1.	Academic administrator keeps his/her promises	12 (4.6)	25 (9.5)	46 (17.6)	1161 (61.5)	18 (6.9)	3.56	0.92
2.	Academic administrator can be trusted to do the things he / she says	12 (4.6)	18 (6.9)	27 (10.3)	177 (67.6)	28 (10.7)	3.73	0.91
3.	Academic administrator can be relied on to honour his / her commitments	23 (8.8)	5 (1.9)	69 (26.3)	136 (51.9)	29 (11.1)	3.55	1.02
4.	Academic administrator always keeps his / her words	13 (5)	18 (6.9)	71 (27.1)	132 (50.4)	28 (10.7)	3.55	0.95
Sub-total (Average)							3.60	0.88

Note: SD = Standard Deviation, f = Frequency, (number) = (%)

Score- 1= Strongly disagree, 2=Disagree, 3=Neutral, 4=Agree, 5=Strongly agree

On the other hand, I was extracted with two lowest score from the four statements. The first statement was “Academic administrator can be relied on to honour his / her commitments” indicated 262 respondents who completed the statement, over half 67.6% indicated “Agree” with 177 respondents selected the statement. A minority of respondents 1.9% indicated “Disagree” with 5 respondents selected it. Meanwhile, 69 respondents (26.3%) indicated “Neutral”, 29 respondents (11.1%) indicated “Strongly Agree” and 23 respondents (8.8%) indicated “Strongly Disagree” to the statement. The mean score for the below statement was 3.5973 with a standard deviation of 0.88.

The second statement was “Academic administrator always keeps his / her words” in which 50.4% indicated “Agree” with 136 respondents who selected it. Other responses to this statement included 13 respondents who selected “Strongly Disagree” at 5% contribution. Meanwhile, 71 respondents (27.1%) indicated “Neutral”, 28 respondents (10.7%) indicated “Strongly Agree” and 18 respondents (6.9%) indicated “Disagree”. The mean score for the below statement was 3.55 with a standard deviation of 0.95.

### 5.8 Overall academic staff's perception on the practice of Ethical Leadership among the academic administrators in IIUM

Table 9 indicates the overall results of the academic staffs' perceptions on the academic administrators' practice on ethical leadership. Basically, according to the academic staffs of IIUM, the academic administrators have all the seven dimensions components of ethical leadership.

The highest scored practice was contributed by the role clarification with the highest mean of 3.73 and a standard deviation on 0.81. There are five items under this dimension which reflected the role clarification of the academic administrators. Apart from that, the second frequent practice was contributed by the dimension of integrity with a mean score of 3.60 and with a standard deviation of 0.88. This dimension has four items reflecting the integrity of the academic administrators. The academic administrators' concern for sustainability is the third most frequent practice with the mean score of 3.42 and standard deviation of 0.58. This is followed by the academic administrators' practice on power sharing with the other colleagues with the mean score of 3.37 and a standard deviation of 0.58.

**Table 9:** Overall academic staff's perception on the practice of Ethical Leadership among the academic administrators in IIUM (N=262)

No	Dimension	Mean	SD
1.	People Orientation	3.10	0.84
2.	Fairness	2.58	1.02
3.	Power Sharing	3.37	0.58
4.	Concern for Sustainability	3.42	0.58
5.	Ethical Guidance	3.33	0.93
6.	Role Clarification	3.73	0.81
7.	Integrity	3.60	0.88

Note: SD = Standard Deviation



In addition, the academic staff rated the academic administrators' ethical guidance as 3.33 mean score and standard deviation of 0.93. On the other hand, the sixth rated by the academic staff is the academic administrators' dimension on the people orientation where the mean score is 3.10 and standard deviation is 0.84. The least frequent practice among others is the dimension of fairness of the academic administrators with the lowest mean score of 2.58 and standard deviation of 1.02.

This is a strong indication that the component of role clarification was the most highly practiced among the academic administrators in IIUM. The future research can be extended to other staff in other organizations, whether it is private or public organization. It does not only mean for academic administrators. It can also include other leaders in the organizations. Leaders must act with integrity as it will give positive impact to the organization and they can easily achieve their purpose.

## **VI. Conclusion**

It can be concluded that academic administrators demonstrated all the seven dimensions of ethical leadership. More specifically, the study shows that role clarification has been perceived as the most frequently practiced by academic administrators based on the ethical leadership behaviour. It is hoped that this research will open the eyes of IIUM to improve further in planning trainings and awareness that are related to the academic administrators. Therefore, these results are useful for the IIUM as it will give a great impact on the academic administrators in IIUM. The impact will be huge throughout the world as we can be seen as a world class university.

## **REFERENCES**

- [1]. Al-Quran al-Karim (1994). Translation. Riyadh: Maktab Darussalam.
- [2]. Abbasi, A. S., Rehman, K. & Bibi, A.. (2010). Islamic leadership model an accountability perspective. *World Applied Sciences Journal* 9(3), 230-238
- [3]. Azuka, E. B.. (2001). Ethics of leadership and the integrity question among leader. Federal Polytechnic Oke, Nigeria
- [4]. Brown, M.E. & Mitchell, M. S. (2010). Ethical and unethical leadership: exploring new avenues for future research. *Business Ethics Quarterly*
- [5]. Brown, M. E & Trevino, L. K. (2006). Ethical leadership: A review and future directions. *The Leadership Quarterly* 17 (2006) 595-616
- [6]. Cielo, J.C. (2007). Influence of ethics and integrity in Peruvian managers' leadership styles: A doctoral research proposal. *Journal of CENTRUM Cathedra*, 94-118.
- [7]. Clarkson, A. (2009). Perceptions of leadership and integrity: a correlation of followers' assessment. Capella University, ProQuest LLC
- [8]. Credo, K. (2010). Organizational Ethics perceptions: A review and qualitative assessment. Auburn University
- [9]. Giacalone, R. A., Promislo, M.D. (2013). *Handbook of Unethical Work Behavior: Implications for Individual Well-Being*, M.E. Sharpe. Inc
- [10]. Kalshoven, K., Den Hartog, D.N., & De Hoogh, A.H.B, (2011). Ethical leader behaviour and big five factors of personality, *Journal of Business Ethics*, vol. 100, issue 2, pages 349-366
- [11]. McCann, J. & Holt, R. (2009). Ethical leadership and organizations: an analysis of leadership in the manufacturing industry based on the perceived leadership integrity scale. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 87, 211-220.
- [12]. McManus, K. (2011). The relationship between ethical leadership, attachment orientation and gender organization. Walden University, ProQuest, Dissertation and Theses.
- [13]. Piccolo, R.F., Greenbaum, R., Den Hartog, D.N. & Folger, R. (2010). Task significance and job autonomy as motivational mechanisms in the ethical leadership process. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 31, 259-278.
- [14]. Quong, T., & Walker, A. (2010). Seven Principles of Strategic Leadership. *International Studies in Educational Administration* 38 (1), 22-34.
- [15]. Rafik Beekun & Jamal Badawi (1999). *The leadership process in Islam*. University of Nevada
- [16]. Resick, C.J., Hanges, P.J., Dickson, M.W., & Mitchelson J.K. (2006). A cross-cultural examination of the endorsement of ethical leadership. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 63, 345-359.
- [17]. Schminke, M., Arnaud, A., & Kuenzi, M. (2007). The power of ethical work climates. *Organizational Dynamics*, 36, 171-186.
- [18]. Toor, S. & Ofori, G. (2009). Ethical leadership: examining the relationships with full range leadership model, employee outcomes, and organizational culture. *Journal of Business Ethics* 90(4): 533-547
- [19]. White, D. D & Lean, E. (2008). The impact of perceived leader integrity on subordinates in a work team environment. *Journal of business Ethics* 81: 765-778