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The current study examined the relationship between emotional intelligence and ethical behavior in one of the large-sized public universities. Approximately 270 administrative employees working at Mid-Atlantic University (MAU) were asked to complete surveys that assessed their emotional intelligence dimensions as well as their level of ethical behavior. This study examined three hypotheses to investigate the relationship between each dimension of emotional intelligence and level of ethical behavior.

Results of the statistical analyses revealed that some of the four dimensions of emotional intelligence are significantly correlated, some positively and other negatively, with different levels of ethical behavior. Even though the first hypothesis states that all four dimensions of emotional intelligence have negative relationships with self-interest ethical behavior, this hypotheses is only partly supported by one dimension, regulation of emotions (ROE). Utilizing of emotions (UOE) has also a significant relationship with self-interest ethical behavior, but it is positive. Also it was hypothesized that all four dimensions of emotional intelligence have positive relationships with rules based and virtue ethical behavior; however, these hypotheses are only partly supported. Explicitly, only one dimension (UOE) is significantly positively correlated with virtue ethical
behavior while the ability of regulation of emotions (ROE) is significantly positively correlated with rules based ethical behavior. Moreover, it was found that others' emotions appraisal (OEA) has a significant negative relationship with virtue ethical behavior which is contrary to what was hypothesized. According to the results of this study, a framework was developed that could be used as a practical guide by human resource departments to use to improve employees' ethical behavior at MAU and others organizations. Additionally, several recommendations were highlighted for future research.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 The Problem of the Study

Ethics is based on the idea of distinguishing right from wrong in order to provide guidance for how an ethical individual should behave. Even though the idea of ethics has been raised as a philosophical view as a means to build a good society, leaders in modern organizations admit the importance of ethics and think about how to enhance ethical behavior among their employees. Even so, it is also argued that maintaining high ethical standards in government is more important than in business or other sectors and this is attributed to different reasons. First, government demands compliance from individuals who pay taxes that allow government to operate, and those taxpayers expect high standards of sincerity and integrity from that government (Denhardt & Denhardt, 2006).

Frederickson (1993) adds that public administrators usually face the dilemma of making critical decisions while they lack information. In these cases, they depend on their ethical values to address problems and inform their decisions. Further, Lipsky (1983) emphasizes a similar and critical issue in which administrators, at the top level as well as street level, might use their power and authority to influence others to make critical decisions. Davis (1971) states that public administrators use discretion when they face problems and take action; such discretion demands high standards of ethical behavior. Also, as Frederickson and Ghere (2005) note, ethics in public administration is a demand to address many issues such as administrative accountability, responsibility and responsiveness. Finally, Frederickson (1993) states that public servants are expected to behave ethically in order to maintain trust in government.
There is a concurrence among public administration scholars and practitioners that a major challenge facing governments today extends beyond how to implement public services to how to enhance public trust in governments (Omotoso, 2014). However, building trust is difficult to accomplish since unethical behavior damages public trust in government as well weakens the basics of democracy (Beeri et al., 2013). For many decades, public trust in government has been declining and that has generated heightened concern toward public employees' conduct and the implementation of ethics codes, resulting in gradual implementation of new ethics programs (Jovanovic & Wood, 2007). Explicitly, as Jovanovic and Wood add, at the local level, municipal ethics codes are developed to direct the behavior of city employees and elected officials in order to generate more assurance that public employees are acting ethically and providing public services in the greatest interest of the community.

This interest in the subject of ethics in public administration has increased in the last three decades (Cooper, 2004). The ethical standards of both elected officials and public servants has gradually become a main issue on the public agenda and garnered the attention of researchers and public practitioners alike (Beeri et al., 2013). Adopting ethics programs is seen as a way to reduce unethical behavior. According to Wechsler (2012), a government ethics program is a program that includes training, consultation and enforcement to increase the ability of government officials and employees to deal ethically and effectively with conflict of interest situations. Conflict of interest situations refers to the many types of behavior such as nepotism (hiring or promoting relatives), advancing self-interest above public interest, and accepting gifts or bribes. Yet, despite
the fact that the number of ethics programs has been growing, the evidence of their effectiveness is still not clear (Uhr, 2005).

Do ethics programs, in fact, positively impact ethical actions in government? Some scholars are doubtful. Stevens et al. (2005) state the effectiveness of ethics programs is affected by different factors such as leaders, ethics training and the interpretation of ethical codes. A program can be effective when leaders feel that it is important, not only to the organizational culture but also to stakeholders. On the other hand, Jovanovic and Wood (2007) think the shortcoming of ethics programs could be seen in ethics training. They state that the conflict here occurs when ethics training is mandatory for all public employees some of the time, yet, indeed, it is allocated to the upper level public employees most of the time. Furthermore, the interpretation of ethical codes can be an obstacle facing public organizations in implementing ethics programs and codes. Weick (1995) states that in order to reduce false interpretation or confusion, the ethics codes have to be clear; however, ethics codes are confusing since those ethics codes usually present ideal information regarding what exactly is allowed or not allowed. Unfortunately, having a combination of ideal and strict rules leads to ambiguity and resulting confusion when the organization faces different conditions.

According to the Ethics Resource Center (ERC), a national survey of human resource professionals conducted by the Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM) showed that only one third of the respondents’ firms had a comprehensive ethics code (ERC, 2008). ERC conducted this national survey in 2011 via random calls to residential households within the 48 contiguous states with a sample that included employees working at public and private organizations. The results indicated that 41
percent of 6,400 workers stated that they have observed misconduct on the job. Explicitly, they found that bribery and kickbacks were observed by fewer than ten percent of employees; however, there were many types of bad behavior observed frequently including misuse of the organization’s time, abusive behavior, resource abuse, lying to employees, and violation of the internet use policy. To be more specific, more than 50 percent of the respondents to the ERC survey of public employees stated that they observed misconduct similar to that described above.

Corruption is a result of unethical practices and is seen when public officials exploit opportunities that put their interests above public interest (Kangogo & Kipttoo, 2013). Miao (2010) stated that corruption generates many negative consequences for a given society. He added that destroying public morality, distorting fairness and social justice and wasting public resources are a few of the negative impacts of corruption. Graycar and Villa (2011) stated that even in the United States, where there is a strong legislative base with severe penalties for corrupt behavior, corruption abounds.

To underscore this point, Graycar and Villa (2011) analyzed data from 100 successfully prosecuted cases from New York City to investigate corruption in public service positions. They concluded that in one-fifth of the cases funds were stolen. In about 70 percent, the corrupt acts were violations of existing regulations, and in about 30 percent, they were crimes of opportunity for private gain. Most importantly, they found that about 80 percent of those cases involved reports that the government was incapable of providing safety or ensuring standards because of unclear boundaries of accountability and responsibility.
Accordingly, if the government is losing its capacity to control and prevent unethical practices and adopting ethics programs that might not be a good tool to ensure ethical practice or behaviors, it is necessary to look for ways to enhance ethical behavior in order to stop and prevent further ethical misconduct. Linda Galindo (2010) asserts that the major problem in business today is a serious lack of ethics, personal responsibility, and accountability. She adds that, to overcome this obstacle, personal ethical standards have to be created. Similarly, Copper (2004) raises the importance of adopting a new and effective ethical approach in public administration, emphasizing the idea of “The Responsible Administrator” in which the view of ethics goes beyond organizational design and rules to depend more on the ability of the administrator to analyze all factors impacting the situation in order to come to an ethical decision.

Further, Masciulli (2011) has strongly emphasized the increased need for ethical public administrators in public organizations due to increased globalization, growing network of governmental and intergovernmental organizations, as well as the current uncertain and complex times. He goes on to say that, emotional intelligence would enhance public administrators’ abilities to judge their organization’s performance in producing goods and providing services and enhance their ethical actions and decisions.

The concept of emotional intelligence has gradually gained acceptance in the field of public administration, and there have been some studies conducted to examine its impact on workplace performance, job satisfaction and communication (Masciulli, 2011; Latif, 2006). Furthermore, Hsieh, Yang and Fu (2011) have emphasized the importance of emotional intelligence in public administration and the need for more studies. Moreover, it has been suggested that the public sector has to adopt emotional intelligence
as a training tool to enhance positive aspects of effective workplace management (Masciulli, 2011; Latif, 2006). Thus, the purpose of this study is to examine the relationship between emotional intelligence and ethical behavior and investigate the use of emotional intelligence as a way to enhance ethical behavior in order to mitigate and cease ethical misconduct in the public sector.

1.2 Research Questions

This researcher argues that if public organizations are suffering from corrupt and unethical practices and a lack of personal responsibility, it is imperative to look for ways to enhance ethical behavior. This paper aims to address the role of emotional intelligence in shaping ethical behavior. This study seeks to answer the following question: **To what extent does a relationship between emotional intelligence and organizational ethical behavior exist?** The study also aims to find answers for these sub-questions:

- What is the level of emotional intelligence of the case study’s administrators?
- What is the level of ethical behavior of the case study’s administrators?
- To what extent are emotional intelligence and ethical behavior related?
- What is the relationship between each dimension of emotional intelligence and administrators' ethical behavior?
1.3 Brief Discussion of the Two Concepts

1.3.1 Ethical Behavior

Organizational ethical behavior is a specialized field of ethics that aims to investigate the application of moral standards and how to apply them to organizations (Velasques, 1998). There is concurrence that individuals differ in how they define and deal with ethical dilemmas in organizations; thus, this is a main reason to have a variety of theories and empirical inquiry. However, the "... mass of ideas, issues, and systems ... [results in] a seemingly chaotic state of ethical principles" (Lewis, 1989, p.806). Wahn (2003) agrees with Lewis when he emphasized the fact that there is no single dominant measure of ethical behavior in the workplace. Wahn attributed this to a lack of consistency in conceptualization of ethical and unethical organizational behavior since each researcher examined different aspects of the issue.

Many scholars have looked at the concept of ethical behavior from a variety of angles. They range from focusing on individual morality in predicting ethical behavior to emphasizing the role of moral thinking in generating ethical behavior (Kelloway et al., 2014). Kelloway et al. (2014) state that most researchers are attracted by the notion of moral thinking and reasoning, and therefore deal with it as a predictor of ethical behavior. This theory of moral thinking and reasoning is the Moral Development Theory developed by Kohlberg (1969) and has had the largest impact on the field of ethical behavior, increasingly becoming the focus of ethics researchers. Thus, this study utilizes this theory in order to understand ethical behavior.
1.3.2 Moral Development Theory

Rest (1993) defined ethical reasoning and judgment as how individuals evaluate different courses of action with regard to ethical principles to decide if the action is ethically right or wrong. The most influential theory of individuals' ethical reasoning is Kohlberg's Moral Development Theory (1969). Kohlberg developed his theory in the late 1960s, and it still dominates the field of ethics decades later. Kohlberg's theory raises the importance of cognitive reasoning and thinking about matters of right and wrong in order to make an ethical decision or to choose to engage in ethical behavior. The theory proposes that people usually conceptualize the issues facing them according to their understanding of ethical principles such as fairness, justice, rights and the welfare of others (Skisland et al., 2011).

The theory suggests that morality is not built in one night, but it is gradually developed. Moreover, moral development, in Kohlberg's view, can be conceptualized as a continuum that starts with a low and concrete level and ends with a high and abstract level. Those levels are:

- **Level 1- Self-interest level**: This reflects individuals who do not care about others, and they do the right things just to avoid punishment or to maximize their self-interest (Kohlberg, 1984).

- **Level 2- Rules based level**: At this level, individuals are more concerned with rules, laws and social approval as well as the welfare of others. Specifically, individuals in level two are motivated by the need for social acceptance and are more oriented to obligation and responding to rules and laws (Kohlberg, 1984).
• Level 3- Virtue level: This is the highest level of morality since it includes those who understand social interest and have a highly developed conscience (Kohlberg, 1984). At this level of ethics, individuals are able to conceptualize right and wrong by the norms of the society, and the individual has a mature ability to distinguish right and wrong as well as to possess and apply universal ethical principles (Skisland et al., 2011).

It is important to note that Kohlberg believes that this development begins in individuals as soon as they are born. In fact, it can also be argued that if these moral stages are not fully developed in childhood then it will be difficult, if not impossible, for an adult to develop them and engage in true ethical and moral behavior. Also, it is clear that, as an individual progresses through the stages of moral development, he or she becomes less concerned with individual interests and more concerned with the community at large as well as experiencing a shared sense of purpose that is evident in the following of rules and sharing of feelings and responsibilities. Hannaha et al. (2014) state that individuals at level three reflect the concept of virtue ethics in which “... they strive to be faithful and productive to the group, conduct themselves in accordance with the group’s mores, and take on personal responsibility to uphold those mores as obligations” (p.221).

Blasi (1980) stated that the idea of individual moral development has turned most of the attention of scholars towards investigating ethical behavior or moral decision-making. He adds that researchers often depend on stages of moral development as a way to predict ethical decision making, actions, and behavior, thus providing empirical studies
that support the hypothesis "that moral reasoning and moral action are statistically related" (Blasi, 1980, p.37).

Many frameworks have been developed relying on Kohlberg’s theory such as those developed by Rest (1986) and Jones (1991). It has to be noted that Rest’s (1983, 1986) work is credited for being a foundation for current studies in the field. Rest (1983) reviewed twelve cross-sectional and longitudinal studies that examined Kohlberg’s theory. Further, Rest (1979) developed the a scale based on Kohlberg’s moral stages, which is considered to be reliable scale that measures moral judgment more effectively than previous ethical scales (Burchard, 2011).

There are many studies that investigate the concept of ethical behavior; however, there is a lack of consistency in the conceptualization of unethical behavior and measurement, making the field of ethical behavior difficult to develop. This does not, however, detract from the importance of ethical behavior; instead, it means the field of ethical behavior is fertile and needs further study. Hannaha et al. (2014) state that the majority of studies conceptualize ethical behavior in ways that are far from virtuous forms of behaviors. Hannah and Avolio (2011) report that further studies need to fully investigate criterion that go beyond the surface to cover extra-ethical, or virtuous, behavior.

Kohlberg’s theory is credited with emphasizing the fact that people are ethically different in how they think and generate their moral actions and behavior. This provides a clearer picture of why there are some people who are selfish and some who are not and why some will work harder than others. Those people who are at the virtue level are definitely desirable for all organizations. This begs the question what could make them
behave so virtuously while others do not? Passyn and Sujan (2006) stated that the ability to act based upon performance measurements and according to rules and laws is different from the aspiration to act inherently with responsibility and accountability. They add that individuals must feel responsible and motivated in order to act ethically.

Passyn and Sujan (2006) reported that emotions enhance the ability to distinguish between right and wrong behavior. They add that an emotion requires a confluence of appraisal and needs a mixture of fear, hope, guilt, regret and frequent self-evaluation. Coelho (2010) stated that confession and penance are important to rehabilitate behaviors, and each requires different steps. He emphasized that recognizing what one has done wrong according to his/her deepest values is the first step to remediating the behavior. The next step is deciding to change in order to obtain self-satisfaction as a response to the expression or confession of the painful truths about the self: “...vital to this confession is some expression of regret or remorse for what one has done or caused” (Coelho, 2010, p.38).

Briefly, ethical behavior might be defined as self-monitoring behavior that emerges from strong and different motives that generate different levels of ethical decisions and behavior. Higher levels of ethical behavior require stronger conscientiousness, experience and emotional motives. These motives could be religious, ethical or spiritual. Spirituality, however, can be seen “...as a form of intelligence because it predicts functioning and adaptation and offers capabilities that enable people to solve problems and attain goals” (Hosseini et al., 2010, p.179). Hosseini et al. (2010) added that psychologists’ conceptions of spirituality are extended by conceiving spirituality as a sort of intelligence which allow it to be associated with rational processes.
and goal achievement. They emphasize that emotional intelligence could be related to spirituality because it enables us “... to judge a situation in which we are involved and then to behave appropriately within it” (p.179).

Kohlberg’s theory depends on cognitive development and the concept that the more people are aware of themselves and others, the greater ability they will have to manage their feelings and will have a higher motivation to do the right thing, and thus they might possess or develop a higher level of ethical behavior (Rest, 1986). Therefore, the researcher suggests that ethical behavior might be enhanced by using emotional intelligence. Since emotional intelligence has been studied, and there is an agreement in the literature that emotional intelligence provides more awareness about self and others and enhances social skills, the researcher believes that it may be a way to enhance ethical behavior as well. Accordingly, this study adopted Kohlberg’s theory of cognitive moral development and its scale in order to look at the level of ethical behavior of the case study’s administrators. More information about the theory and the scale is presented in chapters two and three.

1.3.3 Emotional Intelligence

Salovey and Mayer (1993) define emotional intelligence as “…the ability to perceive accurately, appraise, and express emotion; the ability to access and/or generate feelings when they facilitate thought; the ability to understand emotion and emotional knowledge; and the ability to regulate emotions to promote emotional and intellectual growth” (p.47). Also, emotional intelligence is articulated simply as the ability to monitor, manage and regulate one’s own emotions and understand others' emotions (Latif, 2006, p.82). Hurley et al. (2010) stated that emotional intelligence demands the
cooperative relationship between emotion and intelligence. Emotional intelligence is also viewed as a cluster of many factors that include one’s social and cognitive features and the connection within the explanation of emotion (Hassan et al., 2009).

Moon and Hur (2011) stated that the current conceptualization of emotional intelligence originated with Thorndike’s (1920) study, but it has been gaining greater recognition and acceptance since Goleman published Emotional Intelligence in 1995 and then his model in 1998. The Goleman model (1998) views emotional intelligence as a form of several abilities and competencies that are necessary for effective managerial performance (Bar-On, 2010). Goleman stated that these abilities can be clustered into five core areas (Goleman, 1995; 1998), but other scholars see four components for emotional intelligence. This study adopted the four components of Salovey and Mayer’s model of emotional intelligence, which are (Salovey & Mayer, 1990):

1- Self-emotions appraisal (SEA): a deep understanding of one’s advantages, disadvantages, strengths, weaknesses, motives, emotions and needs.

2- Others emotions appraisal (OEA): the ability to understand the emotions of others and be sensitive to their feelings and emotions.

3- The use of emotion (UOE): the ability of individuals to direct their emotions towards positive and constructive activities and higher performance.

4- Regulation of emotions (ROE): managing spontaneous feelings and distressing emotions well.

As stated before, ethical behavior is a result of internal feelings that enable individuals to judge themselves according to the level of consciousness, self-awareness and the strength of the motives to adjust their actions. Based on Goleman’s definitions, it
is apparent that emotional intelligence could have a role in shaping ethical behavior. Explicitly, self-awareness could be defined as knowing one’s internal status, and self-consciousness is seen as the awareness of one’s inner thoughts (Cole & Rozell, 2011). Self-regulation, which includes self-monitoring, refers to an internal ability to adjust behavior to external and situational factors (Cole & Rozell, 2011) and to decrease negative affect intensity (Velasco et al., 2006), and self-motivation which indicates the importance of motives to encourage individuals. Notably, there are commonalities that seem to be requirements for ethical behavior and emotional intelligence such as the self-monitoring of internal feelings, consciousness, motives and awareness. Thus, there appears to be a correlation between ethical behavior and emotional intelligence, and this correlation requires statistical proof.

1.3.4 Previous Studies Dealing with the Two Concepts

There are numerous studies that examine either ethical behavior or emotional intelligence, and there are studies that discuss the importance of emotional intelligence in generating ethical behavior (Arlie, 2009) or ethical organizations (Wickham & O’Donohue, 2012); however, there are few empirical studies that examine the link between the two concepts. This section reviews studies that investigate this relationship.

Deshpande and Joseph (2009) used 103 hospital nurses as a sample to examine factors impacting ethical behavior. Individual ethical behavior was used as a measurement on a survey/questionnaire that posed scenarios such as “It is acceptable for me to take office supplies,” and “I believe that it is okay to by-pass established protocols in order to be more efficient or effective at work” (pp.405- 406). It was found that the level of emotional intelligence and ethical behavior of peers significantly impact
ethical behavior of nurses. Deshpande (2009) conducted a similar study with 180 non-profit hospitals in Spain, reporting similar results that ethical behavior is positively influenced by the perception of peers, successful managers’ ethical behavior, and emotional intelligence.

Joseph et al. (2009) used the same survey used in previous studies (Deshpande & Joseph, 2009; Deshpande, 2009) to investigate factors impacting perceptions of peers’ ethical behavior in a study with approximately 400 students in four United States universities. The study found that the dimensions of emotional intelligence, except regulation of emotions, had no significant impact on the perceptions of peers’ ethical behavior.

In a study conducted by Mesmer-Magnus et al. (2010), undergraduate students in business and psychology departments in two mid-size universities in the United States were surveyed to examine the impact of emotional intelligence on ethical behavior. This study reported that emotional intelligence is a predictor of individual behavior, perceptions of others’ ethics as well as the perceptions of successful managers. In this study, 12 items were used to ascertain individual ethical behavior. Respondents were asked to indicate the extent to which they might conduct unethical behaviors, e.g., “make personal calls from work, surf the web from work…” (p.39).

Angelidis and Ibrahim (2011) analyzed a survey of more than 300 managers from five universities in the southeastern and northeastern United States who were enrolled in executive MBA programs. The study used a model developed by Forsyth showing two dimensions, idealism and relativism, that impact ethical behavior. It was found that those with higher levels of emotional intelligence believed that actions have to be far from
being misleading or harm others to be considered unethical. On the other hand, respondents at lower levels of emotional intelligence are willing to behave or act even if there are negative consequences.

Krishnakumar and Rymph (2012) used responses to scenarios describing events in the workplace to measure ethical behavior through ethical judgment. The study surveyed approximately 160 junior and senior students enrolled in management classes in a mid-western university in order to determine the impact of emotional intelligence as a mediating effect between negative emotions (sadness and anger) and ethical decisions and behavior. It was found that the role of emotional intelligence is more important when negative emotions are more intense. More importantly, the study raised the importance of re-conducting the study on a different sample that includes practitioners instead of students.

According to the previous brief discussion regarding the empirical studies dealing with the link between emotional intelligence and ethical behavior, there are several points that should be highlighted. First, most of the studies examined non-public organizations. This highlights the importance of conducting a study that deals with public employees. Additionally, most of the studies' samples are students, thus stressing Krishnakumar and Rymph’s (2012) recommendation to use practitioners instead of students to test the relationship between the two concepts. Masciulli (2011) strongly stresses the need for ethical leaders in public organizations and suggests emotional intelligence as a tool to enhance ethical behavior. The researcher therefore used a sample that included administrative employees within the organization under study. Most of the previous research also examined the relationship between ethical behavior and emotional
intelligence in general, ignoring the multiple dimensions of emotional intelligence. This necessitates examining the multiple dimensions of emotional intelligence to see which one(s) has a significant impact on ethical behavior. Moreover, most of the studies self-report unethical behavior, but, as Camps and Majocchi (2010) emphasize, collecting information about ethical judgments by asking about respondent opinions is easier and more credible than collecting self-reported information. It is doubtful that individuals will honestly report that they use the internet during work time, or that they take work supplies home. More importantly, ethical judgment is established within an ethical maturity scale, and Camps and Majocchi also emphasize the idea that, since progress in ethical judgment or ethical maturity positively correlates with ethical behavior, using this scale is highly recommended. However, there is no study, as the researcher found, that uses an ethical development or an ethical maturity scale to examine the relationship between the two concepts.

This study, therefore, filled this gap in four ways: 1) the study dealt with a different setting, public organizations, 2) the study employed a different sample, practitioners not students, 3) the study utilized different ethical scales, and finally, 4) the study examined the relationship between emotional intelligence in general and its multiple dimensions in particular with each level of ethical behavior.

1.4 The Objectives and Importance of the Study

This study investigated the role of emotional intelligence in shaping ethical behavior at a public university. More specifically, the goal of this study was to examine the level of emotional intelligence and its relationship with the level of ethical behavior,
and provide a framework to enhance ethical behavior by using emotional intelligence skills.

There are some scholars who see this relationship and strongly recommend the subject of this study as a way to enhance efficiency in the workplace (Salguero & Fernández-Berrocal, 2010; Masciulli, 2011). The lack of studies that examine the correlation between emotional intelligence and ethical behavior gives the current study value and importance.

Previous studies dealt with the relationship between emotional intelligence in general and ethical behavior in particular in different settings. Specifically, this study 1) dealt with public employees, 2) investigated the relationship between the dimensions of emotional intelligence and ethical development levels, and 3) utilized ethical development scales that have not been used in previous studies dealing with the same subject.

This study is important because it focuses on administrative employees at a public higher education institution in the Mid-Atlantic region of the United States. Employees at public higher education institutions have rarely been studied before; most of the previous studies have focused on college students rather than employees. As Kahtani (2013) states, public higher education institutions, as well as other organizations, are affected by the issues of globalization and competition, which demand those organizations have employees who possess skills and abilities to display high performance. He adds, emotional intelligence has to be one of the factors that must be considered by public higher education institutions.
There are billions of dollars spent in higher education in the United States. According to the State Council of Higher Education for Virginia (SCHEV), approximately $7 billion is spent yearly in higher education in Virginia (schev.edu, 2014). Rezaee, Elmore & Szendi (2001) state that “the public, regulators, and the accounting profession are taking a closer look at colleges and universities that use public resources and [are] trying to find ways to hold these institutions more accountable” (p.171). They raise the importance of adopting codes of conduct as a basis for ethical behavior in colleges and universities. Accordingly, this study could be significant since the investigation shows that ethical behavior is, indeed, correlated to some of the dimensions of emotional intelligence, and, consequently, emotional intelligence could be a way to enhance ethical behavior.

This study may contribute to ethics theory by enhancing our knowledge about ways to enhance ethical practice. Furthermore, the results of the study fill a gap in emotional intelligence theory since there are few studies that investigate its connection with ethical behavior.

Knowing the relationship between the two concepts will be a beneficial contribution, not only to the literature of organizational behavior, but also to human resource management in the public sector. Moreover, the results of the study should benefit human resource management in the organization under study by providing essential information about the level of emotional intelligence as well as the level of ethical behavior that most of its employees have and/or practice. Additionally, this study may demonstrate to organizations how emotional intelligence can be used to evaluate
potential new employees or choose which employees to promote to positions that require high levels of emotional intelligence as well as ethical behavior and decision making.

Many scholars state that emotional intelligence can be taught and reported significant relationships between emotional intelligence training programs and enhancing managerial job aspects such as productivity and efficiency (Goleman, 1998; 2001; Kahtani, 2013; Masciulli, 2011). Thus, the results of this study may benefit ethical training centers by connecting emotional intelligence training and ethical behavior.

1.5 Proposed Model

This study is an attempt to examine the link between emotional intelligence and ethical behavior. The researcher depends on the work of Salovey & Mayer (1990), who suggest that there are four critical pillars or competencies of emotional intelligence, which are self-emotions appraisal (SEA), others' emotions appraisal (OEA), use of emotions appraisal (UOE) and regulation of emotions (ROE). Also, ethical behavior is classified into three levels according to Moral Development Theory developed by Kohlberg (1969). Thus, the study tested the following hypothesis:

H1: There is a negative significant statistical relationship between the self-interest based ethical behavior level and each dimension of emotional intelligence.

H2: There is a positive significant statistical relationship between the rules based ethical behavior level and each dimension of emotional intelligence.

H3: There is a positive significant statistical relationship between the virtues based ethical behavior level and each dimension of emotional intelligence.

Figure 1.1 illustrates these relationships between the independent and dependent variables.
1.6 Methods

The researcher adopted a quantitative design that employs survey-based research to conduct this study. A quantitative research design is appropriate in finalizing results, testing hypotheses, and examining relationships between two or more variables (Simon & Francis, 2001). A basic principle in scientific research is that it should be conducted on all members of a population; however, the researcher relies on a sample, as Atiah (1985) states that, studying the whole population may not be more accurate than studying a
sample. It is also hard to measure the entire population; therefore, studying a sample is more efficient. The sample of this study is the administrative employees of a Mid-Atlantic university, which is referred to as Mid-Atlantic University (MAU). According to statistics released from the Human Resources Department at MAU, there are approximately 790 administrative employees. More discussion about the sample and the job categories of the employees are provided in the methodology chapter.

The researcher included all administrative employees at the MAU as the sample frame, thus the entire sample frame is surveyed. The survey questionnaire is based on existing scales. Explicitly, this study adopted the Wong and Law Emotional Intelligence Scale (WLEIS), which is based on Salovey and Mayer's model of emotional intelligence. This scale has been used in previous empirical studies investigating emotional intelligence and its relationships with different subjects, particularly ethical behavior. This scale uses 16 items to measure four dimensions of emotional intelligence (Law, Wong & Song, 2004): self-emotions appraisal (SEA), others emotions appraisal (OEA), the use of emotion (UOE), and regulation of emotions (ROE). Reliability and validity of the scale across studies has range from 0.80 to .090. Cronbach's alpha for each of the dimensions of emotional intelligence, SEA, OEA, UOE, and ROE, are also high, which are respectively, 0.80, 0.80, 0.80, and 0.85 (Deshpande & Joseph, 2008 ). Each item is measured on a five-point Likert scale (5 = strongly agree, 1 = strongly disagree).

Ethical behavior is also measured on a five-point Likert scale. Rest, Davin and Robbins (1978) are credited with developing the ethical behavior scale (DIT) based on Kohlberg’s theory. Consisting of 10 items divided to measure each of the three levels of ethical behavior (self-interest, rules based, and virtue), some of the items are scenarios,
(Rest, 1986; Weber, 1990) while some are questions (Kelloway et al., 2014; Sörderhamn et al., 2011). The study also adopted the Moral Development Scale for Professionals (MDSP), which is one of the scales that was developed based on Kohlberg’s Moral Development Theory and (DIT) scale. The instrument was developed to investigate moral development among individuals, which is the goal of this study. Many studies reported high validity and reliability of the scale (Sörderhamn et al., 2011).

In order to check whether the questions are clear, understandable, and reliable in terms of their appropriateness to measure the variables of the study, the questionnaire and a summary of the objectives of the study were administered to a group of experts. Additionally, to confirm the accuracy of the formulation of questions, a pilot survey is conducted and modifications were made based on the feedback from experts and public administrators.

This study investigates if there is a relationship between emotional intelligence and ethical behavior in the study sample. Explicitly, the four dimensions of emotional intelligence are tested as the independent variables and the three levels of ethical behavior as the dependent variables. One of the multivariate statistical techniques used for data analysis is the dependence technique. Dependence techniques are useful or appropriate when one or more variables can be identified as dependent variables and the remaining as independent variables (Hair et al., 2010). Standard multiple regression is used to examine the relationship between the level of administrators’ ethical behavior and their emotional intelligence level. Further discussion is provided in the methodology section.
1.7 Summary

This study investigates the relationship between emotional intelligence and levels of ethical behavior. To clarify the concept of emotional intelligence and ethical behavior, a brief review of the two concepts and the studies investigating their relationships have been discussed. After reviewing the previous studies dealing with both concepts, this study is important because it focuses on the administrative employees at one public higher education institution since employees at public higher education institutions have rarely been studied before. The results of this study might contribute to the field of ethics and emotional intelligence theoretically and practically. A quantitative approach using an online survey to collect the data was implemented to achieve the objectives of this study. The next chapter reviews the literature associated with emotional intelligence and ethical behavior.
CHAPTER 2
LITERATURE REVIEW

The purpose of this chapter is to provide an understanding of the existing literature that informs this study. Even though the concepts of emotional intelligence and ethical behavior have been widely studied individually, there have been few studies that have examined the relationship between emotional intelligence and individual ethical behavior. Thus, this literature review is an in depth explanation of the concepts of emotional intelligence and ethical behavior and their theories, processes, and competencies to obtain a clearer picture about the two terms and then to develop a theoretical framework for this study.

2.1 What is Emotional Intelligence?

Before we go in depth in defining emotional intelligence, the “emotion” and “intelligence” need to first be operationally defined individually before being combined. Phin (2009) sees emotion as "a moving of the mind or soul". Robbins and Judge (2009) state that there are many types of emotions such as happiness, sadness ... etc, and the best way to deal with the concept of emotions is to divide them into two categories: positive emotions, such as happiness, joy, accomplishment, and negative emotions, such as sadness, grief, or feelings of failure. While emotions may be viewed as simply feelings, they go far beyond this simple concept. The notion of emotion has been developed into a complex level due to the progression of theories that have resulted from the study of emotions.

There are many theories dealing with emotion; however, this research focuses on the four most recognized theories of emotion that outline our understanding of the
concept. They are the James-Lange Theory, Cannon-Bard Theory, Schachter-Singer Theory, and Opponent Process Theory of emotion. The following is a brief explanation of the four theories,

The James-Lange Theory is the oldest of the four, and it suggests that emotion is not directly generated as the heart’s response to an event, but rather it is caused by the body’s response to the event. In this sense, if you have been in a scary situation, your heart will beat faster, and thus your brain will understand that you are experiencing fear. This results in your response to that fear as seen when you run away from that which has frightened you (Plutchik & Kellerman, 1980).

The Cannon-Bard Theory disagrees with the previous theory. In 1927, Cannon conducted an experiment and concluded that there are many similar bodily responses that generate different emotions. Put simply, when you experience a fast heartbeat, you might be angry, fearful or excited. Thus, the cause could be positive or negative. In that sense, the brain cannot depend on only bodily responses to distinguish which emotion is experienced. Philip Bard supported Cannon’s assumption, and both continued exploring emotion in the brain. They concluded that emotions do not need input from the body, rather both the emotion and the bodily response occur at once independently (Plutchik & Kellerman, 1980).

In the 1960s, Stanley Schachter and Jerome Singer proposed another theory that suggested that experiencing emotion demands both a bodily response and an interpretation. This theory is also known as the Two-Factor Theory of emotion and is an example of a cognitive theory of emotion. This theory suggests that in order to experience an emotion, the physiological stimulation, or bodily response, occurs first, and
then the reason behind this arousal has to be identified by linking the event or situation surrounding the individual and the bodily response (Plutchik & Kellerman, 1980).

In 1974, two psychologists, Richard Solomon and John Corbi, developed the Opponent-Process Theory of emotion. This theory proposes explanation of the emotion in relation to its opposites. Explicitly, it suggests that the experience of an emotion demands an interruption in the balance of the body's state, and consequently, emotions naturally have their opposing correspondents. For example, when the individual experiences pain or fear, s/he will look for a balanced emotion such as pleasure or relief (Plutchik & Kellerman, 1980).

As noted previously, the development of emotion theories generate the progress of our understanding of emotion. Old theories see emotion as feeling. This concept has advanced to see it as a combination of feeling and cognition, and then to see emotion as feeling coupled with motivational factors and cognition. Cognitive Theory is currently the most widely recognized basis to define the psychological processes of emotion (Varga, 2014). Varga states that cognitive theory explains human behavior by understanding the process of thinking. But to understand the emotion, there are different components that have to be considered. While Frijda (1986) points out the motivational element as a phenomenon that has to be understood in order to explain the emotion, Moors (2009) and Barrett (2006) see emotion as a combination of different components such as a cognitive, feelings, and motivational, as well as a motor component that leads to expressive behavior. That explains why people react to the same event differently. Explicitly, the motivational component pushes the individual to respond based on how the individual defines the surrounding situation utilizing cognitive processes combined
with how fast these processes are performed and generate different actions or behavior in
different people. It has to be noted that the processing of the cognition and scanning
facts and information in a short time is considered an essential sign for intelligence
(Carlson & Jensen, 1982). That leads to a discussion of what intelligence is.

The idea of cognitive processes has been considered as a main factor of
intelligence. Vernon (1983) outlines the progress of the definition of intelligence
according to the progress of cognitive process. In the 1970s, the ability to scan
information in short term memory was considered an indicator of intelligence. But at the
end of the 1970s, the definition of intelligence went beyond short term memory to
include the ability to retrieve information from long term memory as well. In the
beginning of the 1980s, scholars began to see intelligence as the ability to scan
information in short term memory, recall information from long-term memory, and the
ability to react and make correct decisions in a short time. By this time, the concept of
intelligence was getting complex.

Howard Gardner (1983) provided the Theory of Multiple Intelligences in which
he suggests the concept of interpersonal intelligence, among others. His theory goes
beyond how the individual perceives the situation and understands his or her motivations
and processes the information to see intelligence as the ability to understand others. The
theory of multiple intelligence is also known as social intelligence or interpersonal
intelligence.

The idea of interpersonal intelligence is similar to the concept of emotional
intelligence. Barrett and Salovey (2002) state that the term of "Emotional Intelligence" is
Emotional Intelligence, which was published in 1985; however, the publication of Daniel Goleman’s Emotional Intelligence: Why It Can Matter More Than IQ II, was the main factor in making the concept of emotional intelligence well known.

As discussed previously, emotions can be seen as feeling coupled with cognitive processes that are affected by the ability to understand one’s situation, motivation and abilities to express an accurate response or behavior. On the other hand, intelligence combines two components: the monistic stage of intelligence and the plural or multiple stage of the intelligence concept. In the monistic stage of intelligence, the individual has the ability to understand her/himself and recall information in the short and long term to express an accurate decision. Further, in the multiple or interpersonal stage of intelligence, the individual has the ability to understand others and combine it with the first stage to make accurate decisions and have appropriate responses. It needs social skills and sensitivity to others’ abilities and actions. Thus, intelligent people have the ability to understand themselves and others in order to make decisions that are more accurate or display more appropriate behavior than those who lack those abilities.

Now, it is easy to combine our understanding of emotions with the concept of intelligence to outline a simple definition of emotional intelligence. Accordingly, emotional intelligence could be seen as the ability to understand one’s feelings, abilities and desires and the ability to understand other’s feelings, desires, actions and abilities to manage and regulate our understanding in order to generate accurate responses, decisions and actions. Figure 2.1 illustrates the idea of this combination of emotion and intelligence.
This definition is similar to how other scholars define emotional intelligence. Hurley et al. (2010) state that emotional intelligence can be defined as the ability to enhance the relationship between emotion and cognition since emotional intelligence refers to the accommodating relationship between emotion and intelligence. Salovey and Mayer (1990; 1997) adopt the concept of social intelligence to outline the concept of emotional intelligence. They see it as the capability to accurately assess one’s own emotions and the emotions of others and the ability to regulate and manage one’s own emotions and use those emotions to accomplish goals and effectively solve personal and social problems. Fletcher (2007) adopts previous definitions to identify emotional intelligence as an interpersonal component that refers to the capacity of individuals in making relationships with others and controlling their own and other’s emotions.
Moreover, Bar-On (2005) sees emotional intelligence as the ability to 1) understand ourselves and others, 2) make a good relationship with others, and 3) deal with their environment effectively.

Mackin (2006) states that emotional intelligence is a product of many communications and links between the rational and the emotional parts of the brain. Hassan et al. (2009) view emotional intelligence as a group of many aspects of one’s social and cognitive factors and the linkage within these as the explanation for emotion. Porter and Woodworth (2007) suggest that emotional intelligence demands cognitive and interpersonal skills, while Hoffman (1984) proposes that there are two mechanisms of emotional intelligence, which are the cognitive component that generates precise perceptions of others’ emotions and the empathy component. He emphasizes the role of empathy in facilitating understanding of the roots of these emotions, and thus minimizing the negative conception about others, and then giving complete views about others. The role of empathy is not new since, as Kahtani (2013) reports, it was discovered over twenty years ago, and it has been stated that the most effective people are those who can understand and identify others’ emotions.

2.1.1 The History of Emotional Intelligence Measurements

Psychological researchers have classified the literature of emotional intelligence into three models: ability, traits and mixed model. The ability model includes the ability to 1) observe our feelings, desires and emotions, 2) observe other’s feelings, desires and emotions, 3) utilize this information, and 4) regulate and direct thinking and actions. The traits model is comprised of non-cognitive capabilities such as general mood, self-esteem and self-actualization. Finally, the combination of model capabilities and the model of
characteristics of emotional intelligence refers to the mixed model of emotional intelligence (Kahtani, 2013). However, Fry and Carol (2003), in a meta-analysis study of effective and valid scales of emotional intelligence, suggest that emotional intelligence can be conceptualized as an ability or personality trait since it tends to facilitate a better performance in the workplace.

The Bar-On Theory/model is made up of the main aspects of effective emotional function generating psychological well-being. This theory emphasizes five components and each component has sub-scales. The five components consist of intrapersonal, interpersonal, adaptability, stress management and the general mood. The intrapersonal component means that the individual who has this component has a high level of self-esteem, self-actualization, emotional awareness, assertiveness and independence. Interpersonal, the second component, is constructed depending on the aspects of empathy, interpersonal relationships, and social responsibility. In Bar-On Theory, it is suggested that flexibility, problem solving, and individual reality testing are the main characteristics of the third component, adaptability. The fourth component, stress management, demands a high level of stress tolerance and instinct control. This theory also highlights the importance of having cheerful, joy and optimism as positive general moods that the person has to have and express to be considered as emotionally intelligent (Jorfi, Jorfi, & Moghadham, 2010).

The second model is Mayer-Salovey Four-Branch model of emotional intelligence. It is called a four-branch model because it suggests that there are four dimensions of emotional intelligence, and all of the four dimensions are related to each other (Mayer & Caruso 2002). The first two dimensions, distinguishing emotions and
using those emotions, are known as perception and facilitation, respectively, because both deal with feelings. The third dimension is understanding one's emotions as well as others' emotion and the mechanism of emotion and their impact on behavior. The last dimension, managing emotions, is known as strategic emotional intelligence since it is considered as planning, calculating information and managing emotion (Kahtani, 2013).

In that model, Salovey and Mayer (1990) see emotional intelligence as an ability model consisting of four different dimensions. The four dimensions of emotional intelligence are self-emotional appraisal (SEA), others' emotional appraisal (OEA), regulation of emotion (ROE), and use of emotion (UOE). Self-emotional appraisal (SEA) is the ability of an individual to assess and understand their deep emotions. People who possess high levels in this area will distinguish and recognize their emotions correctly compared to others. Others' emotional appraisal (OEA) is related to the ability to assess and acknowledge emotions in others. Individuals who have this ability will have more sensitivity to the emotions and feelings of others. Use and utilization of emotion (UOE) refers to the ability to use and utilize emotion to facilitate thought and performance. Regulation of emotion (ROE) is the ability to manage emotions.

The Goleman's competence model (1998) views emotional intelligence as a form of various competencies and skills that contribute to successful managerial performance (Bar-On, 2010). Goleman (1995; 1998) classifies these abilities into five core areas: self-awareness, self-regulation, self-motivation, social awareness, and social skills. Self-awareness is the first component of emotional intelligence and includes a deep understanding of one's advantages, disadvantages, motives, emotions, and needs (Goleman, 1995; 1998). It has been proposed that a high level of self-awareness
generates a higher level of awareness of personal feelings, abilities, skills, motives, weaknesses and strengths and how those aspects can affect one as an individual and impact their job performance as well as others. Consequently, individuals with high self-awareness will have high self-confidence.

Self-regulation is the second component in the Goleman's Model. It includes self-control, trustworthiness, and conscientiousness. While self-control refers to the ability to effectively manage natural feelings and difficult emotions well, trustworthiness means maintaining high standards of honesty and integrity. Furthermore, conscientiousness refers to taking responsibility for personal actions, either positive or negative.

Emotional intelligence is also related to contemporary theories of motivation such as Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs and Self-efficacy Theory. Goleman recognizes the importance of motivation to facilitate success, so he includes self-motivation as one of the main components. He assumes that individuals are influenced by their desire to accomplish their goals, so they work hard and show commitment and initiative. As noted previously, the concept of emotional intelligence is affected by the concept of social intelligence, and that makes Goleman consider social awareness as one of the main emotional intelligence components. Social awareness is a good approach to being sensitive towards other’s feelings as well as to understanding others. Goleman emphasizes the importance of social skills such as communication, leadership, and influence in order to affect others towards desired situations.

Numerous research scales and instruments have been developed based on these models of emotional intelligence. Accordingly, there are trait scales, ability scales and
mixed scales that measure the combination of both traits and ability. Bar-On, (1997) developed the term "EQ" ("Emotional Quotient") to assess both emotional and social competence. Accordingly, he developed the Emotional Quotient Inventory (EQ-i) which is considered as the first test of emotional intelligence. Additionally, Goleman (1995; 1998; 2001) developed an EI competence model. Goleman (1995; 1998) conceived EI as a related twenty-one competencies clustered under four categories of skills and abilities. Accordingly, Boyatzis and Goleman (2002) developed the emotional competency inventory (ECI) to measure the competency of individuals and organizations by using observer ratings in terms of efficiency and performance. Based on the Salovey and Mayer (1990) model, Mayer et al. (2000) developed the Mayer-Salovey-Caruso emotional intelligence test (MSCEIT) that consists of four branches: noticing and expressing emotion, using emotion in thought, understanding emotions, and managing emotions (Offerman et al., 2004).

Moon (2011) adds that EQ instruments can be classified as either an ability measure or mixed measure. While the MSCEIT is primarily an ability measure, the ECI is a mixed measure used to assess traits, abilities, and personality as well as competencies. According to Moon (2011), Salovey and Mayer’s (1990) ability model and Goleman’s (1998) competency model are the two key conceptualizations that generate numerous studies for emotional intelligence. However, Van Rooy and Viswesvaran (2004) conducted a meta-analysis study in which they compare emotional intelligence scales and concluded that the ability scale, which is based on Salovey and Mayer’s model, is a superior scale, and in their words, the best way to conceptualize emotional intelligence is as "the set of abilities (verbal and nonverbal) that enable a person to
generate, recognize, express, understand, and evaluate their own, and others, emotions in order to guide thinking and action that successfully cope with environmental demands and pressures" (p.83). This scale is widely used in numerous studies, and its validity and reliability are reported as high, more than .83 (Schutte et al., 1998). Furthermore, Söderhamn et al. (2011) state that MSCEIT is the best way to, not only measure strong and weak points in an individual, but also to enhance the abilities of emotional intelligence after reviewing the feedback.

There is a group of scholars who think that the main limitation of the MSCEIT scale is that the scale might not be an accurate measure of emotional intelligence in different cultures or for people with oriental backgrounds since it was developed depending on western populations (Law, Wong & Song, 2004; Wong & Wong, 2004). Therefore, in 2002, Wong and Law developed the most recent scale, which is the Wong and Law Emotional Intelligence scale (WLEIS) (Murphy, 2010). This scale is based on Salovey and Mayer's model and the MSCEIT scale, but it is modified to be better fitted to people from different cultures. More importantly, the WLEIS scale has been used across numerous recent studies and its reliability and validity is reported as high. Because of that and since workplaces are mostly diverse and have employees from different cultures and background, the researcher will adopt the WLEIS scale to measure EI in the study sample. Simply put, the researcher will depend on the four factors of emotional intelligence proposed by the theory of Salovey and Mayer which are: Self-Emotion Appraisal (SEA), Others-Emotion Appraisal (OEA), Use of Emotions (UOE), and Regulation of Emotion (ROE) as independent variables to investigate the relationship between emotional intelligence and ethical behavior.
2.1.2 The Importance of Emotional Intelligence

Goleman's model is considered as a proposal to generate effective managers and higher job performance. Other scholars believe in the importance of emotional intelligence, not only because of its relation to job performance, but also because they have tested its linkage with different organizational and personal aspects and have concluded that emotional intelligence is an essential tool to develop leaders and employees. The importance of emotional intelligence is highlighted throughout the abundance of studies that examine the relationship or effect of emotional intelligence on different topics. While Goleman tries to prove that emotional intelligence is correlated with high performance and managerial skills, some scholars go beyond that to emphasize the importance of emotional intelligence in coping with stress (Ramesan, 2009; Wu, 2011). In fact, emotional intelligence has been examined from different aspects that can be grouped as follows:

2.1.2.1 Emotional intelligence and job performance

Numerous studies have been conducted to examine the relationship between emotional intelligence and job performance. In an empirical study, Mishra and Vikalpa (2010) found that there is a significant positive relationship between emotional intelligence and job performance. Using an EI scale and job performance scale, it was found that when the emotional intelligence score increased, there was an associated increase in individual job performance. Also, Shooshtarian, Ameli and Aminilari (2013) examined the relationship between emotional intelligence, job satisfaction, commitment, and job performance. This is similar to what Psilopanagioti et al. (2012) as well as Wong and Law (2002) found in their studies. They found that employees' emotional intelligence
is positively correlated with job satisfaction. Consequently, there is a relationship between employees' emotional intelligence and their job performance. On the other hand, research has shown no significant relationship between organizational commitment and emotional intelligence (Ameli & Aminilari, 2011).

Adeoye and Torubelli (2011) conducted a study in an attempt to explain the effects of emotional intelligence and human relationship management on the organizational commitment of 300 Nigerian civil servants. To achieve the purpose of their study, the researchers used three scales to independently measure emotional intelligence, human relationships, and organizational commitment. The results indicated that both independent variables (emotional intelligence and human relationships) predicted organizational commitment. Those results are similar to Moon and Hur's (2011) study, but they emphasized that emotional intelligence alone does not directly influence job performance since job performance is affected by other intervening factors. Robbins and Judge (2009), in their meta-analysis of 59 studies, concluded that emotional intelligence is moderately related to job performance.

2.1.2.2 Emotional intelligence and psychological personality growth

Bar-On (2010) notes that positive psychology is defined as “...positive characteristics and strengths that enable individuals to thrive … it is based on the belief that people want to lead meaningful and fulfilling lives, to cultivate what is best within themselves, and to enhance their experiences of love, work and play” (p.56). In 2005, Bar-On conducted a study to examine the relationship between emotional intelligence and positive psychology. Based on factors of well-being, he concluded that the two concepts are highly correlated. He outlined the factors of well-being as the ability to
accept one's emotion, 2) reach personal goals in order to increase one's perspective, and 3) identify one's feelings and place things in precise standpoints.

There are many researchers that raise the importance of five core personality traits in the workplace. The theory of the big five factors of personality and its effectiveness have been examined over the past 50 years (McCrae & Costa, 1987). These five factors are extraversion, agreeableness, conscientiousness, neuroticism and openness (Goldberg, 1981). More importantly, in a meta-analysis conducted by O'Boyle et al. (2011), a high positive correlation between emotional intelligence and the five factors of personality was found.

2.1.2.3 Emotional intelligence as a way to provide good leadership style

Research regarding the relationship between emotional intelligence, leadership styles and leadership effectiveness and making decisions is gradually emerging. Stanescu and Cicei (2012) conducted a study based on a framework of transformational/transactional leadership and its relationship with emotional intelligence. The results showed a significant positive relationship between transformational leadership and emotional intelligence, on one hand, and between leadership effectiveness and emotional intelligence, on the other. They also found a significant negative correlation between passive leadership and emotional intelligence. Additionally, Rehman and Ajmal (2012) found that emotional intelligence moderates the correlation between transformational leadership style and decision-making styles. Explicitly, a transformational leadership style strongly predicts rational and dependent decision-making styles and negatively correlates with avoidant decision-making style.
2.1.2.4 Emotional intelligence and cultural competency

Diversity is a main characteristic of our daily life and in the workplace. Organizations have to adopt cultural competencies in order to survive and be successful. Cultural competency is the ability to be sensitive towards others, to know their needs and desires, and to respect their beliefs and values (Basham et al., 1997). Nybel and Gray (2004) identify cultural competency as a crucial competent that every successful administrator, social worker, manager and employee must possess. They add that it can be achieved by developing cultural awareness, mastering knowledge and skills and building inductive learning opportunities about others. More importantly, emotional intelligence could be a vehicle that facilitates cultural competency since it includes the ability to understand others’ needs, desires and actions. Cherbosque (2009) states that emotional intelligence has the ability to go beyond cultural boundaries to open the door for the individual to adjust to diverse cultures and backgrounds.

2.1.2.5 Emotional intelligence and effectively dealing with customers

It has been reported that employees who have high levels of emotional intelligence will have the ability to understand the desires and the needs of the customer (Yao, Wang & Karen, 2009). Also, emotional intelligence can enhance self-control so that the employee or the administrator can control their emotions and express only positive emotions when they have difficulties with the customers (Ciarrochi et al., 2006). Ciarrochi et al. (2006) add that because emotional intelligence facilitates complete understanding of the problem, employees having higher levels of emotional intelligence are able to solve problems and conflicts effectively as compared with those who have
lower levels. Accordingly, emotional intelligence could be a way to have higher customer satisfaction.

2.1.2.6 Emotional intelligence and living a better life

Previous discussion highlights the components of emotional intelligence and how emotional intelligence can generate better managers, leaders, customer service, higher job satisfaction, and higher job performance. Additionally, emotional intelligence can enhance individual daily life. Kahtani (2013) stresses this point when he says people with less emotional intelligence will have more negative impacts on their lives. He attributes that to the fact that when someone has a low level of emotional intelligence, s/he will have fewer abilities to understand either her/ his own or other’s emotions, desires and needs, and consequently, will have less control and less ability to manage those emotions and less ability to effectively overcome conflicts and challenges in order to solve problems. On the other hand, he adds, higher levels of emotional intelligence facilitate the ability to build good relationships with others and live peacefully. Further, Pathak, Jaiswal and Patwardhan (2013) state that because emotionally intelligent people are superior in correctly realizing others’ emotions, they might be more likely to correct others’ unethical behavior in order to moderate circumstances. But, they do not indicate that those emotionally intelligent people necessarily have or conduct ethical behavior, which leads us to raise the question: do higher levels of emotional intelligence generate higher levels of ethical behavior? To answer this question, we have to review the literature of ethical behavior.
2.1.2.7 Emotional intelligence and public service motivation and emotional labor

The public administration literature has many claims that the motivations of individuals working in the public service sector vary in important ways from others working in different sectors (Perry, 1996). Public service motivation, as Perry views it, represents "an individual's predisposition to respond to motives grounded primarily or uniquely in public institutions" (p.5). Perry conceptualized public service motivation to develop a scale that includes six dimensions: attraction to public policy making, commitment to the public interest, civic duty, social justice, self-sacrifice, and compassion. His conceptualization of public service motivation and his scale is highly accepted and used in empirical studies in public organizations.

How public administrators can be encouraged to express accurate emotions when interacting with citizens is important in public service and has been studied for a long time. Service organizations usually have certain emotional display rules that give employees information about which emotions they have to express and which they should hold back while providing the service. When employees manage their emotions and express what display rules demand, they engage in a different form of labor which is labeled emotional labor. Emotional labor research is growing, both inside and outside the field of public administration. Hsieh, Yang and Fu (2011), however, touch a nerve when they emphasize the importance of emotional labor in public administration. They attribute that to the mechanism of public service delivery that necessitates face-to-face exchanges between public administrators and citizens. Hochschild (1983) divides the concept of emotional labor into two main types: surface acting and deep acting. This distinction is built on the idea of whether the feeling is internal or external when the worker interacts or
does his/her duty. Explicitly, surface acting is shaped when the employee expresses an emotion with no feeling while deep acting is the opposite.

Hsieh, Yang and Fu (2011) examined the relationship between public service motivation and emotional labor and found that public service motivation is negatively related to surface acting and positively related to deep acting. They concluded that public employees with higher levels of public service motivation are more likely to express deep acting and serve citizens effectively. Furthermore, emotional labor goes beyond serving clientele or customers effectively to cover different managerial aspects. Meier and Wilason (2004) state that organizations with more emotional labor will have better interactions with clientele, more positive relationships within the organization, higher levels of organizational commitment and, consequently, will be more effective than other counterpart organizations performing the same functions. Additionally, many studies reported a positive relationship between emotional labor (deep acting) and job satisfaction. Explicitly, Wharton (1993) found that employees who perform emotional labor will have lower exhaustion and enjoy higher levels of job satisfaction than those who do not perform emotional labor.

As discussed above, service employees try to fulfill organizational display rules by regulating their emotions, and engaging in either surface acting or deep acting. Nevertheless, not all employees have the capabilities to effectively regulate their emotions (Rathi, 2014). The importance of emotional intelligence in managing emotions has been reported, and many researchers claim that highly emotional intelligent employees are better able to regulate their emotions and express accurate emotions and actions than those with lower levels of emotional intelligence (Wong and Law, 2002;
Joseph and Newman, 2010). Grandey (2000) conducted a study to investigate the relationship between emotional intelligence and emotional labor and found that employees with high levels of emotional intelligence tend to express real emotions and engage in deep acting strategies of emotional labor more than employees with low emotional intelligence. These results indicate that emotional intelligence influences the emotional labor process. Furthermore, as Mastracci, Guy and Newman (2012) state, emotional intelligence is required in the workplace where jobs need emotional labor to be done effectively.

2.2 Ethical Behavior

Wahn (2003) as well as Lewis (1989) stress the fact that the concept of ethical behavior is still chaotic because of the mass of ideas and issues dealing with organizational ethical behavior. To be specific, Velasques (1998) states that individuals do not consistently define nor address ethical dilemmas in organizations. This generates obscurity in the conceptualization of ethical and unethical organizational behavior, thus explaining why researchers have examined different area of studies and dilemmas by using different conceptualizations of the concept of ethical behavior and, consequently, different scales, which further contributes to the ambiguity of the relationship between these two concepts (Wahn, 2003).

Ruegger and King (1992) and Yaghoubi et al. (2011) see unethical behavior as the performance of harmful work or practices, the lack of an employer’s responsibility regarding their employees’ safety or welfare, the misuse of organizational time for personal interest, and/or the informing on either employers or peers. Khazanchi (1995), on the other hand, classifies ethical behavior into seven categories: social responsibility,
accountability, disclosure, honesty, conflict of interest, personal conduct, and protection of privacy. Additionally, while Weishurd et al. (1991) addresses anticompetitive activity, mail fraud, and bribery as unethical organizational behavior, Wahn (2003) focuses on two types of unethical behavior: competitive and compliant behavior. Competitive unethical organizational behavior refers to those behaviors that serve one's own interests without regard for peers. Compliant unethical behavior refers to the idea that unethical behavior is a result of a direct order or organizational pressure.

Effelsberg et al. (2014) state that employee behavior can be classified into two types: pro-organizational and ethical behavior. Though these two appear to be separate concepts, they are actually and inexplicably intertwined. For example, citizenship behavior is a type of ethical behavior since it includes aspects of ethics such as helping others; however, this can be seen as unethical behavior if it is at odds with organizational interests. Also, pro-organizational is considered unethical behavior because it includes actions that might violate ethical norms that harm the interest of customers and stakeholders. For example, the concealment of product defects could benefit the organization while harming the public, and thus are seen as natural unethical organizational behavior. Accordingly, they raise the importance of distinguishing between unethical behavior and pro-organizational behavior.

Hunt et al. (1989) created a new concept of ethical behavior in their research on the ethical problems associated with marketing. Their concept of ethical optimism reflects the perceived connection between ethical behavior and managerial success. In this sense, employees with a high level of ethical optimism are those who consider managers as successful only if they behave ethically. Thus, the concept and the
measurement of ethical optimism have been used to examine organizational ethics in different subjects and settings (Deshpande, 1996; 2009; Vitell & Davis, 1990; Jaffe & Tsimerman, 2005).

Even though there are different perspectives regarding answers to the question of what ethical behavior is or how to define the concept of ethical behavior, Treviño et al. (2006) define it as "those acts that reach some minimal moral standard, and are, therefore, not unethical, such as honesty or obeying the law" (p.52). This definition, while broad, provides a basic tool for distinguishing ethical behavior from unethical behavior within organizations. Following this line of reasoning, ethical behavior includes basic individual values such as honesty, integrity, loyalty, accountability and responsibility as well as obligation and morality.

The concept of ethical behavior has generated many studies that investigate a myriad of factors that influence ethical organizational behavior. A review of the literature reveals that gender, perception of peer's ethical behavior, leaders' ethical behavior, and ethical climate are all factors that have been empirically tested, and their influence has been found to be statistically significant.

Feigold (1994) conducted a meta-analysis and found that there are gender differences in being assertive or dominant. Furthermore, Gladue and Bailey's (1995), in another meta-analysis, found that males are more aggressive than females. Additionally, Whan (2003) compared 400 male and female Canadian librarians' willingness to conduct competitive unethical organizational behavior on one hand, and their readiness to behave unethically by acting in accordance with organizational pressure, on the other. They found that men reported a higher level of readiness to engage in unethical behaviors,
unethical competition and compliance. Whan, however, thought this difference to be spurious and attributed it, not to gender, but to a difference in position of authority since men might, most likely, be in positions of authority.

Not only does gender affect ethical behavior in the workplace, but the ethical climate has also been found to impact employees' ethical behavior. In one of the most recent studies investigating the two concepts, it was found that care guide, independent judgment guide and rule of law guide are negatively correlated with employees' anti-ethical behavior, while the utilitarian orientation has a positive influence upon employee's anti-ethical behavior. Some believe that a caring climate is superior compared to other organizational climates in generating ethical behavior (Ma Lu & Zhu, 2013); however, Deshpande et al. (2011) found that the rules climate has influenced ethical behavior since it is reported mostly by 118 Chinese managers. Although, this difference could be attributed to the cultural impact on employees, since Chinese culture is mostly collective and prefers rules and more control, while American culture is individualistic and prefers less control (Hofstede & Paul, 2002).

According to Organizational Learning Theory, individuals interact with each other and influence each other. From this point of view, the ethical behavior of peers has a significant impact on an individual's ethical behavior (Fu & Deshpande, 2012; Han et al., 2013). More importantly, Deshpande and Joseph (2000; 2008) reported that the impact of peers' behavior on individual behavior exceeds the impact of other ethical climate types. Fu and Deshpande (2009) as well as Deshpande (2009) emphasized the role of managers' ethical behavior in influencing individual ethical behavior.
In regard to managers’ ethical behavior, it is necessary to discuss the importance of the role of leadership and management in developing the ethical climate in the workplace. According to Keslman (2012), leaders should be the main source of guidance for ethical behavior for, not only employees, but also for consumers and other stakeholders. Hannah, Avolio and May (2011) provide a theoretical framework that explains how authentic leaders influence their followers’ behaviors and attitudes. Positive organizational behaviors, such as hope, identification, and trust, are influenced by leaders’ ethical behavior and his/her demonstration of these characteristics.

Accordingly, there is a lack of clarity about the concept of ethical behavior. This has encouraged the researcher to focus on what generates the ethical actions and what makes individuals able to decide whether the action is ethically right or wrong. There are different ethical theories that provide diverse explanations for different actions and behavior, whether ethical or unethical. Those ethical theories are discussed in the following section.

2.2.1 Ethical Theories

Forsyth (1992) emphasizes the ideas of idealism and relativism. Idealism refers to universal norms of ethics in the sense that harming others is considered universally unethical. But those who have low levels of idealism believe that moral actions do not always generate pleasant outcomes and harming others could be necessary to have desirable outcomes. Accordingly, relativism is the degree of the rejection of universal moral rules when making moral decisions. So, as Victor and Cullen (1988) and Fritzsche and Becker (1984) state, individuals use reasons to clarify their ethical decisions and actions, and those reasons are derived from and associated with different ethical theories.
They add different ethical behaviors could be rationalized and explained according to ethical or moral theories. There are many ethical theories, but the researcher will focus on the most accepted ones.

Ethical Egoism Theory assumes that people naturally behave in a way that fulfills their self-interest. (Reidenbach & Robin, 1990). Thus, the moral assumption of this theory is that when the act is to promote the individual's interest, either in the long or short term, this act is considered ethical by the individual (Jones, Felps & Bigley, 2007). Jones and his colleagues state that this theory is contrary to the moral principles of other theories such as helping others, caring, or following the rules of the society or organization.

Schumann (2001) states that utilitarianism places more emphasis on the ends than the means. According to the utilitarian moral principle, the value of the act is determined by the benefit of the outcome or consequences (Butts & Rich, 2008). Rachels (1999) states that this theory aims to generate social welfare and depends on the calculation of the benefit for the whole society. Kant (1998) turns our attention to the fact that, under the shadow of this theory, all individuals are equal regarding their welfare, but they could be treated differently in order to maximize the general welfare. Under this theory, the suitability of an agent's perspectives is neglected, and individuals are treated as the means to achieve the ends (Sandler, 2010). Ferrell, Fraedrich and Ferrell (2009) state that the basic doctrines of utilitarianism is that right, wrong, good or bad actions or decisions should be consequent of a cautious analysis of the costs and benefits of a given situation.

Deontology Theory is associated with the intention behind the action which could be a sense of duty (Kant, 1998) or religious tradition (Butts & Rich, 2008). Opposite of
utilitarianism, the action is determined as ethically wrong or right according to the intention rather than its consequences, and it is assumed that all individuals have to be considered as ends not means (Bowie, 2002). It is assumed, then, that ethical behavior should go beyond net social benefit and be associated with universal principles of rights and duty as well as justice (Ferrell, Fraedrich & Ferrell, 2009). Under the umbrella of these theories, the individual at an organization can participate in order to solve organizational dilemmas if s/he only will fulfill his/her self-interest (egoism), or s/he has to do it as a duty by the rules (deontology) or because of the welfare of the organization regardless of his/her perspective (utilitarianism). Some scholars raise the idea of relativism in which ethical behavior could differ among individuals, cultures and societies (Loo, 2002).

None of these theories explains why one participates and acts to solve the problem even if others are not willing to do so. Virtue Ethical Theory, however, can provide an explanation. According to Virtue Ethical Theory, there are particular ideals, such as excellence or attachment to the common good such as justice, fairness, social responsibility and accountability, which motivate a person to act ethically (Mintz, 1996). This theory is based on ancient Greek philosophy in general and the work of Plato and Aristotle in particular who believe that the goal of the existence of humans is to detect the excellence of virtue (Crossan, Mazutis & Gerard, 2013). Interestingly, these theories can be understood through the interpretation of Kohlberg’s theory. Kohlberg’s Moral Development Theory, which is called also Cognitive Moral Development Theory, divides each theory into different proposed stages as discussed in the following section.
2.2.2 Moral Development Theory

The difference between idealism, relativism, and other ethical theories can be understood using Kohlberg’s theory for reasoning and developing morality. The theory assumes that morality is gradually developed and takes time to build on; it is an accumulative or incremental process. Moral development, in Kohlberg’s view, is a continuum line starting at a low level and ending at a high level of ethics or morality. Additionally, Kohlberg believes that this development begins in children as soon as they are born, and if moral stages are not completely developed in childhood, then there is no way for an adult to develop and engage in moral behavior. Those levels are the pre-conventional level, the conventional level, and the post-conventional level. Each level includes two stages (Kelloway et al., 2014).

Pre-conventional refers to those individuals who are selfish and do not care about others, and they do the right things just to avoid punishment (stage 1) or to fulfill their self-interest (stage 2) (Kelloway et al., 2014). This level is called the self-interest based level since it reflects individuals who strive to protect themselves and maximize their own interests. At this level, the impact of egoism assumption is clear: the individual considers promoting his or her self-interest as an ethical action. In other words, Weber (1993) states that, at this level of Moral Development Theory, a particular behavior or action is judged as “good” if it prevents punishment and promotes pleasure, happiness and satisfaction.

At the conventional level, rules, laws, the welfare of others, and social approval are the aspects that individuals are more concerned with. Specifically, stage three reflects individuals who are motivated by and looking for social acceptance, while the idea of
duty and responding to rules and laws are dominant in stage four. Obviously, the
development of moral behavior throughout the stages is comprehensive since the
individual becomes less interested in maximizing his or her interest to become more
concerned with the community at large and attached to the rules in order to share
responsibilities and feeling with others (Kelloway et al., 2014; Kohlberg, 1981). Because
this level reflects those individuals who are more concerned with rules and doing their
duty and use this principle to reasoning their behavior, this level could be called the rules
based level. At this level, individuals identify an action as good if it is acceptable
according to social, governmental, and organizational rules, and those principles are
implemented to justify ethical actions (Kohlberg, 1981).

Post-conventional is the highest level of morality since it goes beyond self-
interest and rules to consider social interest (stage five) and requires a highly developed
conscience and conscientiousness (stage six) (Kohlberg, 1981). At this level of ethics, as
Söderhamn et al. (2011) point out, individuals have mature abilities to discriminate
actions as right and wrong and conceptualize right and wrong by applying universal
ethical principles. Moreover, despite the fact that individuals, at stage five, are still
attached to laws and rules, they strive to modify those rules according to social goals
(Trevino, 1986). Hannaha et al. (2014) state that individuals in stage six of level three are
a mirror of virtue ethics because they are attached to universal values and principles and
strive to take personal responsibility to uphold those norms. Kohlberg states, as many
scholars do, however, that it could be harder to find individuals associated with stage six
than those at stage five (Weber, 1993). At this level, individuals show the capability to
actively, not passively as seen in the previous level, think and process information in
order to have universal moral standards and to follow those standards to find moral 
solutions. They are attached to universal principles such as justice, reliability, integrity 
and human rights, and they believe those principles are superior to any laws or rules. Rest 
(1979; 1986) views the theory as advanced in understanding individual ethical behavior. 
He modified the theory to have three levels with no need to divide them to different 
stages. The three levels of the theory are illustrated in the following figure (Figure 2.2):

*Figure 2.2: Three levels of ethical behavior according to Kohlberg’s Moral Development Theory*

In discussions of Moral Development Theory, the impact of utilitarian/ 
consequential and deontological theories are understood when the individual asks the 
questions: “What do I have to do? Or who must I be?” The answer will be associated 
with one of these theories. Explicitly, consequentialists focus on cost–benefit equations 
while deontologists analyze rules and laws and prioritize principles to rationalize their 
actions, unlike virtues, who seek truth and broaden their perspectives in order to conduct 
an ethical behavior or decision (Crossan, Mazutis & Gerard, 2013).
Kohlberg's moral levels show how and why people are ethically different. It is superior because it fulfills our curiosity by answering the questions of why there are some people who do not care about others while others, on the extreme opposite side, consider how other people feel and strive to help them and prevent harm, why others work hard, or even harder than others even though no one asks them to do so, while others do not.

There is no doubt that each organization desires to have virtues or people who are at the virtue level. Moreover, those people will work with higher responsibility, motivation, and accountability and give more to the organization as compared with those who act based on rules and performance measurement (Passyn & Sujan, 2006). Thus, how can the organization get them to behave so virtuously? The researcher suggests that ethical behavior might be promoted by enhancing emotional intelligence since there is an agreement, as seen previously, that emotional intelligence is a good way to enhance the self and others' emotional awareness and enhance the ability to understand and direct those emotions to conduct an accurate action. Kohlberg's theory depends on cognitive development in which the more individuals have awareness of themselves and others and have higher levels of motivation, the greater the chance for them to be at a high level of ethical behavior. Therefore, this study adopts Kohlberg's theory and scale to determine if there is a significant relationship between emotional intelligence and ethical behavior. The next section will discuss the theoretical framework of ethical behavior and emotional intelligence.
2.3 Theoretical Framework of Ethical Behavior and Emotional Intelligence

After reviewing the literature regarding the concept of emotional intelligence and ethical behavior in general and the Moral Development Theory in particular, the researcher has found that there are many common aspects between the two terms, and those aspects can be clustered into three points: competencies, processes and the theory behind the two concepts.

Competencies in the workplace are generally defined as individual abilities and skills generating excellence in performance (Spencer & Spencer, 1993). Accordingly, ethical or moral competencies mean a set of skills and abilities facilitating ethical behavior or emotional intelligence. According to Moral Development Theory, there are four components: moral sensitivity, moral judgment, moral motivation, and moral character (Rest, 1986). Moral sensitivity refers to the awareness of the moral problems before conducting any behavior, and it has two aspects: considering whether the behavior will harm or help other people, and then choosing the action from different options (Sa’nchez, 2013). Rest and Narva’ez (1994) emphasize that moral sensitivity or awareness demands recalling possible scenarios and implementing empathy.

The ability to assess good/bad or right/wrong actions is referred to in the second component of moral judgment. The individual has to be able to distinguish between different actions and label them as ethical or unethical actions (Rest, 1986; Sa’nchez, 2013). The moral motivation component refers to the ability and willingness to become involved in an ethical course of action, and it demands personal responsibility for the outcomes. Other scholars, such as Kish-Gephart et al. (2010) and Crossan, Mazutis and Gerard (2013), consider the component of moral motivation as a moral intention. In order
to act ethically, the individual has to have the ability to overcome difficulties, frustration, stress and fatigue; this ability is considered moral character (Hannah, Avolio & May, 2011).

Ethical behavior shares relatively similar competencies with emotional intelligence. In other words, the competencies of emotional intelligence go hand in hand to support and strengthen the competencies of ethical behavior and facilitate the process of conducting an ethical action. According to Goleman (1998), emotional intelligence demands several competencies. He summarizes these competencies under main categories, assuming that there are four factors of emotional intelligence and that each one has special competencies. Explicitly, self-awareness demands emotional awareness, self-assessment and self-confidence. Self-regulation refers to the possession of high levels of self-control, trustworthiness (standards of honesty and integrity), conscientiousness (taking responsibility and accountability), and innovativeness (being open to new and novel ideas). Self-motivation, which is the desire to meet a standard of excellence, has many competencies such as initiative (readiness and willingness to act), commitment, and optimism (persistence despite difficulties and obstacles and setbacks). Social awareness, on the other hand, is one of the main factors of emotional intelligence that demands the competencies of empathy (imagine situations, sensing others' feelings, desires and viewpoints and then considering their concern).

In terms of the process, Sañchez (2013) points out that the theory of Kohlberg depends on psychological process. It begins with moral awareness, then moral judgment, and ends with moral intention that generates moral behavior. It has to be noted that the outcomes from moral intention might be different from the results of moral judgment.
Simply put, according to Rest (1986) and Sańchez (2013), there are many other factors impacting the stage of moral intention such as personal interests and the evaluation of harm for each action; thus, moral judgment gives an assessment of each action but does not decide which action will be chosen. In other words, the person could consider a particular action as unethical but generate an intention to adopt it and vice versa. Figure 2.3 illustrates the process of ethical behavior under Kohlberg’s theory:

*Figure 2.3: Illustrating the process of ethical behavior under Kohlberg’s theory*

Interestingly, this process is similar to the process of emotion in general and emotional intelligence in particular. As seen previously, Moors (2009) and Barrett (2006) consider emotions as a process that starts with feeling, then cognitive processes in which the individual judges the actions and understands the situation. This stage is affected by motivational factors that determine the motor component which leads to expressive behavior. Furthermore, according to Salovey and Mayer’s model of emotional intelligence, emotional intelligence starts with self-awareness and other’s emotional awareness leading to the regulation of those emotions, then continues with the process, to finally end with the use of the emotion to express an appropriate action or decision. The following figure, Figure 2.4, illustrates these process.
Combining the two concepts, it is clear that both emotional intelligence and ethical behavior have common aspects in terms of both the processes and competencies. Pathak, Jaiswal and Patwardhan (2013) state that thought and emotions were considered comparatively separate, but from 1970 onwards, studies have confirmed the interrelationship between thought and emotions and emphasized the role of cognitive intelligence. Accordingly, highly emotional intelligent people are more skilled at reasoning through their own and other’s emotional background and use this information to direct thinking as well as actions. They add that individuals who have low levels of emotional intelligence will have fewer abilities to manage their emotions and will react more aggressively to others’ behavior. In that sense, individuals who have higher levels of emotional intelligence will have higher levels of self-assessment, self-control, conscientiousness, trustworthiness, empathy, and they desire to meet standards of honesty. They also will be superior in their ability to manage their emotions and analyze the surrounding situations in order to generate an appropriate action.

The Self-Concept Maintenance Theory provides an explanation for the psychological processes that shape moral behavior while providing an indirect inference
to its relationship to emotional intelligence. This theory assumes that people try to balance different objectives when making moral judgments. They make efforts to balance between maximizing benefits and having high self-concept. Many studies show that unethical behaviors are conducted when there is a maximizing of benefits and ignoring of the self-concept. Self-awareness is important to generating self-image and self-consistency (Welsh & Ordonez, 2014); therefore, emotional intelligence can be seen as a vehicle that drives higher levels of self-awareness and goes beyond that to provide the ability to highlight weaknesses and suggest how to improve them. In terms of ethical behavior, emotional intelligence will strengthen the factor of self-concept and prevent the individual from conducting unethical behavior.

Passyn and Sujan (2006) reported that emotions could enhance the ability to distinguish right from wrong behavior. They add that an emotion requires a confluence of appraisal and needs a combination of fear, hope, regret and frequent self-evaluation. From a psychological perspective, Coelho (2010) stresses the importance of confession and penance in order to rehabilitate behaviors, and they require different steps. He emphasizes that remediating the behavior demands recognizing what one has done wrong according to his/her deepest values, then, deciding to modify behavior in order to accomplish self-satisfaction. In contrast, Mordhah (2012) sees ethical behavior as a self-monitoring act that demands strong self–monitoring behavior generated from strong and different motives, and those motives are derived from different levels of ethical behavior. She adds that higher levels of ethical behavior require stronger conscientiousness, experience and emotional motives.
This study assumes that emotionally intelligent people will be able to assess the moral situation and make accurate judgments regarding different available actions and decide whether those actions are ethical or not. Because people have high levels of empathy and conscientiousness, they know social norms of ethics and make accurate judgments and intentions. The stage of intention to act is affected by their desire to be involved in ethical action and, more importantly, to meet excellence standards (virtue). Their standards of honesty and integrity, their ability to accept responsibility and accountability for the outcomes also impact the stage of making intentional or choosing an appropriate ethical behavior.

Law, Wong and Song (2004) concluded that high emotional intelligence enables individuals to understand their own emotions, control them and direct them to generate appropriate actions. Also, emotionally intelligent people are able to overcome the stress and fatigue that could inhibit making accurate intentions as seen in a study conducted by Akerjordet and Severinsson (2007). Consequently, emotionally intelligent people will have higher levels of ethical behavior as compared with those who have lower levels and possess fewer emotional intelligence competencies.

As an example to clarify the previous point, Cohen, Pant and Sharp (1995) conducted a study to compare the ethical reasoning of accounting students and practitioners in Canada. The study found that accounting professionals see many scenarios as less ethical while accounting students view them as ethical. The authors raised an important point that the students might have less sensitivity regarding those scenarios, and consequently, they made inaccurate judgments. That leads to the assumption that, if the students have high levels of empathy or the ability to imagine the
scenario and sensitize the conditions and people included into the scenario and their feelings and how the actions could harm or help them, they will generate precise decisions. As seen previously, empathy is one of the components of emotional intelligence.

More importantly, virtue ethics stresses the ability of individuals who have virtues such as justice and wisdom to make higher degrees of accuracy in judgments about the best alternative for ethical actions or decisions (Mele’, 2005). From previous discussions, competencies of emotional intelligence can strengthen the competency of virtue and generate higher levels of ethical behavior.

It could be argued that ethical behavior can be a predictor or an indicator of the level of emotional intelligence or, in other words, individuals who have a high level of ethical behavior will have a high level of emotional intelligence, and those who behave unethically will have a low level of emotional intelligence. However, many scholars see this relationship to be one way in the sense that emotional intelligence will predict unethical or ethical behavior and not vice versa. They attribute that to the fact that it is easy to find individuals who are honest and behave ethically, but their level of emotional intelligence might be not that high. Also, individuals with a high level of emotional intelligence will have the ability to manage their actions in order to behave ethically. According to the Moral Development Theory, moral reasoning development depends upon perceptions of the ethicality of others in which individuals will be ethically influenced by their perceptions of others’ behaviors (Kohlberg, 1984). Further, Mesmer-Magnus et al. (2010) state that the level of perceptions of unethical behavior is “predicated on understanding and empathizing with the origins of self and other behavior
as well as attributions of emotions to others’ behaviors, understanding and managing one’s emotions, etc., emotional intelligence will be related to ethicality” (p. 36, 37).

There are many components of emotional intelligence, but the main ones are cognitive and empathetic components. Mayer and Salovey (1993) state that highly emotionally intelligent individuals will have more ability at reasoning since they are more adept at understanding their emotions and others’ behavior and are better able to use this information to direct their thinking and facilitate accurate actions. The empathy component generates the ability of understanding of the antecedents or causes of these emotions, and, consequently, avoids those causes and lessens negative attributions about others. Thus, highly emotionally intelligent individuals will be able to manage their emotions and actions and behave less aggressively toward others and also mitigate unethical behaviors (Hoffman, 1984; Mesmer-Magnus et al., 2010). Accordingly, emotional intelligence can be seen as a tool to enhance ethical behavior, or to at least mitigate unethical behavior.

MacIntyre (1984) states that virtues can be defined as “our desires and emotions are to be put into order,” which enables one to move from the former state to the latter, and realize “our true nature and to reach our true end” (p. 52). He identifies three-fold schema to develop an individual’s virtue ethics which are (1) who I am today; (2) what I have to be; (3) and how to move from where I am towards what I have to be and which practices of ethics I have to adopt. Culham and Bai (2011) state that MacIntyre’s development of individual’s virtue ethics demands a high level of self-awareness, which is a key component of emotional intelligence. That is, individuals have to aim to intentionally develop themselves by becoming aware of their emotional abilities and then
working to adopt new ethical practices to change negative behaviors. From previous discussion, it could be accepted that a high level of emotional intelligence is an indicator of a high level of ethical behavior.

Many studies have examined the impact of emotional intelligence on ethical behavior, but none of them, except Fue (2014), examine the impact of the facets, or different competencies, of emotional intelligence on ethical behavior. Rather, they focus on general emotional intelligence. Deshpande and Joseph (2009) and Deshpande (2009) find that the level of emotional intelligence and ethical behavior of peers significantly impact ethical behavior. It has also been found that emotional intelligence impacts the perceptions of peers' ethical behavior (Joseph et al., 2008). However, these studies investigated the relationship between the two concepts, but according to the perception of peers, not to the individuals themselves. In the study of Mesmer-Magnus et al. (2010), the impact of emotional intelligence on ethical behavior was investigated and concluded that emotional intelligence is a predictor of individual ethical behavior.

In Fue’s (2014) study, he examined the relationship between different dimensions of emotional intelligence and ethical behavior according to 507 public employees in China. This study found that the regulation of emotions is the only dimension of emotional intelligence that significantly impacts ethical behavior. This current study is in line with Fue’s suggestion of conducting further future research in business ethics and other areas to focus more on the impact of facets or dimensions of emotional intelligence instead of focusing on overall emotional intelligence. Additionally, most of the studies dealing with the two concepts, even Fue’s study, use a self-reporting unethical behavior scale and rarely use the scale of moral development. The researcher, as well as other
scholars, believes that collecting information about ethical judgments is more credible than asking about unethical behavior. In doing so, the researcher will use a scale of Moral Development for Professional (MDSP) to determine the level of ethical behavior accurately.

From previous studies and after reviewing the literature regarding the two terms, the relationship between emotional intelligence and ethical behavior is theoretically hypothesized, suggesting that higher levels of emotional intelligence can generate higher levels of ethical behavior. In other words, a higher level of emotional intelligence will not be positively associated with the self-interest level of ethical behavior. Accordingly, this study examined the relationship between each dimension of emotional intelligence and the level of ethical behavior. The study adopts the following hypothesis to be tested:

H1: There is a negative significant statistical relationship between the self-interest based ethical behavior level and each dimension of emotional intelligence.

H2: There is a positive significant statistical relationship between the rules based ethical behavior level and each dimension of emotional intelligence.

H3: There is a positive significant statistical relationship between the virtue based ethical behavior level and each dimension of emotional intelligence.

2.4 Summary

A review of the literature has provided an understanding of the concepts of emotional intelligence and ethical behavior. This study adopted the Salovey and Mayer's model and scale to study emotional intelligence. Additionally, the study depends on Kohlberg's Moral Development Theory and scale to understand the variety of ethical behavior levels and to examine individual ethical behavior and its relationship to the level
of emotional intelligence. The structure of these relationships is summarized in three main hypotheses according to a theoretical framework. The following chapter describes the methodology that is implemented in this study.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

In this chapter, the research methodology that has been used to conduct this study is discussed. First, the proposed model followed by the research setting and unit of analysis of the study, and the population and sample size are identified. Then, the variables and the measurement of those variables are described. Finally, the approach to data analysis is described.

The researcher adopts a quantitative design that implements survey based research to conduct this study. A survey is a system for collecting information from people in order to describe or study the phenomenon being investigated (Fink, 2003). Creswell (2003) states that a quantitative approach is an appropriate method when the researcher is investigating relationships between variables, using measurements, and testing hypothesis, and those three components are included in this study. Additionally, Newman (2003) reports that there are many steps that should be applied in order to follow a quantitative, or deductive approach. The researcher has to begin by developing the research questions and hypotheses as an initial step, which has been done in the previous chapters. Then, the researcher has to decide the type of survey, the target population, sample size, and plan how the data will be analyzed. The final step is the presentation of the results. While the first step is explained in the previous two chapters, this chapter is allocated to the second step and the third step will be discussed in the fourth and fifth chapters.
3.1 Proposed Model

As described in the previous chapter, the hypotheses were formulated and the conceptual model was based on the literature review and the work of Salovey and Mayer (1990) and the Moral Development Theory. Salovey and Mayer suggest that there are four critical pillars or competencies of emotional intelligence, which are self-emotions appraisal, others' emotions appraisal, use of emotions appraisal and regulation emotions appraisal. The Moral Development Theory suggests that there are three levels of ethical behavior which are: self-interest based, rules based and virtue based. According to the literature review, the researcher proposes that each component of emotional intelligence has a positive relationship with the level of ethical behavior except the self-interest level. The literature of both ethical behavior and emotional intelligence indicates that the individual with a higher level of emotional intelligence will have a higher level of ethical behavior that goes beyond self-interest level. Accordingly, the study tested the following hypotheses:

H1: There is a negative significant statistical relationship between the self-interest based ethical behavior level and each dimension of emotional intelligence. Figure 3.1 illustrates this hypothesis:
H2: There is a positive significant statistical relationship between the rules based ethical behavior level and each dimension of emotional intelligence. Figure 3.2 illustrates this hypothesis:

Figure 3.1: Proposed model for H1

Figure 3.2: Proposed model for H2
H3: There is a positive significant statistical relationship between the virtue based ethical behavior level and each dimension of emotional intelligence. Figure 3.3 illustrates this hypothesis:

Figure 3.3: Proposed model for H3

3.2 Research Setting and Unit of Analysis

A public university in the Mid-Atlantic region of the United States has been chosen as the setting for the study. Previous studies do not rely on samples that include administrative employees working in higher education where it is imperative to find ways to prevent misconduct of ethical behavior to protect public resources, and this will allow the study to make a contribution to the field.

This university, which will be referred to as Mid-Atlantic University (MAU), operates with approximately 790 administrative employees who perform administrative
tasks. The administrative employees are classified under three categories: administrative, professional faculty, and classified employees. The first category includes administrative faculty who perform the work required to manage educational and/or general activities either in the individual educational departments or the entire institution, including all subdivisions. These positions are usually at no lower than three levels below the president such as deans, associate deans and departments chairs. Professional faculty are those who have advanced learning and specialized work experience such as librarians, counselors and other professional jobs in research, education, athletic and student affairs as well as development functions. Classified employees include all the administrative employees who are not faculty members. Explicitly, classified employees or salaried employees are those whose terms and conditions of employment are subject to the Virginia Personnel Act, Code of Virginia Section. Simply, administrative employees who perform administrative tasks and are not faculty members.

This study investigated the relationship between emotional intelligence and ethical behavior. In doing so, each individual administrative employee in the sample is surveyed. The unit of analysis is the individual administrative employee who works at MAU. Then, the data were aggregated to describe the level of emotional intelligence and the level of ethical behavior that administrative employees working at MAU possess to see if there was a relationship between the two concepts.
3.3 Population and Sample Size

The population under investigation is all of the administrative employees working at higher education large sized universities in the United States. Since having responses from the entire population would be difficult, the study depends on one university. According to College Data and College Board websites, a large university usually indicates to a university that has more than 15,000 students. Public universities that have more than 30,000 students are labeled as huge sized universities (College data, 2015). Accordingly, this study applies to all large-sized universities that have 15,000 to 30,000 students. University of Iowa, Oregon State University and Indian University-Purdue University are examples of universities that qualify as large universities. To be specific, University of Iowa and Indian University-Purdue University have approximately 22,000 students while Oregon State University has about 24,000 students (College Board, 2015). A Mid-Atlantic University (MAU) that has been chosen to collect the sample from is considered as one of the large public universities since it has about 20,000 undergraduate students.

According to Sprinthall (2007), a sample means a small number of observations or responses taken from the total number to make up the population. He adds that to have accurate results, the sample used should contain the same overall elements. According to the Census Bureau Statistical Abstract of the United States (2012), in 2009, the administrative employees in the higher education institutions are about 46 percent male and 54 percent female, which are similar to the statistics of the MAU administrative employees. Explicitly, according to the Human Resources Department at MAU, the administrative employees are 59 percent female and 41 percent male. Even though the
researcher has no recent statistics regarding ethnicity of the population, the sample could still be representative since the MAU administrative employees are characterized as diverse and has a variety of administrative employees with different backgrounds. To be more specific, the Human Resources Department at MAU has reported that half of the population is white, 36 percent are black, and 14 percent are classified as “other”.

The population of MAU administrative employees is small enough to allow for inclusion of the entire population as a sample frame; however, it is impossible to have responses from the entire population. Accordingly, the size of the analytic sample has to be considered. The size of the analytic sample means the number of the units that have to be surveyed to have accurate results and reliable findings (Fink, 2003). In order to estimate the least required analytic sample size, Parten (1950) provides a formula which has been used to determine an effective sample size required to yield reliable and valid results. The formula is as follows:

\[ n = \frac{(z \text{ score})^2 - \text{StdDev} \times (1 - \text{StdDev})}{(\text{Margin of errors})^2} \]

Where \( n \) = sample size, \( z \text{ score for 95\%} = 1.96 \) and \( \text{StdDev} \) = Standard deviation which is the expected in the responses and 0.5 is the most forgiving number and also it is a sign indicating that the sample is large enough (Lock et al., 2012). \( \text{Margin of errors} \) = error tolerance or the confidence of interval that determines how much the researcher is willing to let the sample means fall higher or lower than the population mean. The most accepted error tolerance is +/- 5\% (Mann, 2012). Depending on previous elaboration, it is easy to calculate the sample size as follows:
\[ n = \frac{(1.96)^2 \times .5 \times .5}{.05^2} \]

\[ n = 384.16 \]

Accordingly, 384 respondents are needed. However, since the size of population of administrative employees at MAU (sample frame) is known, which is 794, there is Slovin's formula that can be used to determine what sample size is large enough to have accurate results. The formula is written as Ariola (2006) states:

\[ n = \frac{N}{(1 + Ne^2)} \]

Where \( n = \) sample size, \( N = \) Total number of the sample frame and \( e = \) Error tolerance (5%):

\[ n = \frac{794}{1 + 794 \times (.05)^2} \]

\[ n = \frac{794}{2.985} \]

\[ n = 265.9 \]

Both formulas give the researcher an idea of how large the sample needs to be to have a high confidence of the accuracy of the sample. According to the Parten's formulas, the analytic sample size has to be at least 384 participants, but 266 participants is also acceptable according to Solvin's formula. Additionally, Alerck and Settle (2004) state that experienced researchers regard a sample of 100 respondents as a minimum sample size, and they prefer to have 100 respondents for each dependent variable. According to their opinion, the study has three dependent variables and 300 participants
are sufficient to have accurate findings. The researcher obtained 268 responses that are valid to be analyzed. Figure 3.4 illustrates the population, sample and analytic sample of the study.

*Figure 3.4: Illustration of the population, sample and analytic sample of the study*

### 3.4. Variables

This study investigated the relationship between emotional intelligence and ethical behavior in the study sample. Thus, the dimensions of emotional intelligence will be tested as the independent variables and levels of ethical behavior as the dependent variables.
3.4.1 Independent Variables

Independent variables are defined as the variables that the researcher has control over and can manipulate (Dodge, 2003) and have an effect on the dependent variable (Newman, 2003). In this study, the independent variable is emotional intelligence, which is the capacity to manage and regulate one’s and other’s emotions precisely and efficiently (Mayer & Salovy, 1995). The concept of emotional intelligence has four components which are self-emotions appraisal (SEA), others emotions appraisal (OEA), the use of emotion (UOE), and regulation of emotions (ROE). Accordingly, this study has four independent variables since it aims to see the relationship between each component of emotional intelligence and ethical behavior. Explicitly, the independent variables are: SEA, OEA, UOE and ROE.

3.4.2 Dependent Variables

A dependent variable is simply the variable that depends on others variables or factors (Mann, 2012). Sprinthall (2007) states that the independent variable is the antecedent, and the dependent variable is the consequence. He adds that when the researcher looks for a relationship between two variables, the researcher tries to see why the dependent variable has changed the way it does. In this study, the researcher is interested to see why some people have higher levels of ethical behavior while others do not in terms of their emotional intelligence. Thus, the dependent variable is ethical behavior.

This study adopted the Moral Development Theory that was developed by Kohlberg (1969) who assumes that moral development is a continuum that starts with a low and concrete level and ends with a high and abstract level of moral development. It has three
levels that starts with a lower level (self-interest based), progresses to a moderate level (rules based), and ends at the highest level (virtue based). In so doing, this study has three dependent variables according to the levels of ethical behavior in addition to the total score of the scale of ethical behavior.

### 3.4.3 Control Variables

Feigold (1994) and Bailey (1995), in their meta-analysis studies, report that there are differences between males and females according to their ethical behavior. Even though Whan (2003) thought this difference can be attributed, not to gender, but to a different aspects such as position of authority. This study controlled for gender in order to determine if there is a difference in the relationship between the emotional intelligence and the level of ethical behavior in males and females. Also, job categories were controlled for as Whan suggested. To avoid the impact of ethical behavior training, the participants were asked if they have been exposed to ethical training or not. In addition to gender, job categories and ethical training, the researcher controlled other factors that might affect ethical behavior. As discussed in the previous chapter, it was found that the perception of peer’s ethical behavior, leaders’ ethical behavior, and ethical climate are factors that have been empirically tested, and their influence on ethical behavior has been found to be statistically significant. This study has six control variables, which are gender, job categories, ethical training, and perception of peer’s ethical behavior, leaders’ ethical behavior, and ethical climate.
3.5 Measures

In this study, the first part of the survey was allocated to measure the concepts of emotional intelligence and ethical behavior while the second part contained the demographic questions and some controlling variables. The independent and dependent variables in addition to some of the controlling variables (perception of peer’s ethical behavior, leaders’ ethical behavior, and ethical climate) are measured by using five-point Likert response scales. Demographic variables such as age, level of education and experience are measured by ordinal scales, while gender, ethical training, and race are measured by nominal scales. In doing so, the survey instrument has a variety of response formats. Some items require yes or no responses. Some provide interval choices, while others provide a selection of five points on the Likert response scale.

Emotional intelligence has many scales, some of which are trait based, ability based and mixed based; however, this study adopted the Wong and Law EI Scale (WLEIS). This scale has been used in previous empirical studies investigating emotional intelligence and its relationship with different subjects, particularly ethical behavior. This scale has four dimensions of emotional intelligence (Law et al., 2004). Self-emotions appraisal (SEA) is measured using four items such as: “I have a good sense of why I have certain feelings most of the time,” and “I have a good understanding of my own emotions.” Others emotions appraisal (OEA) is also measured using four items, such as, “I always know my friends’ emotions from their behavior,” and “I have a good understanding of the emotions of people around me.” Four items are also attached to measure the use of emotion (UOE) with statements such as “I always set goals for myself and then try my best to achieve them,” and “I am a self-motivating person”. Regulation
of emotions (ROE) is measured using items such as “I am able to control my temper so that I can handle difficulties rationally,” and “I have good control of my own emotions”. All items are measured on a five-point Likert scale (5 = strongly agree, 1 = strongly disagree). Reliability and validity of the scales is proven across studies to be 0.80 to .090. Moreover, as Deshpande and Joseph (2008) state, Cronbach’s alpha for the dimensions of the emotional intelligence, SEA, OEA, UOE, and ROE, are also high, which are, respectively, 0.80, 0.80, 0.80, and 0.85.

Development of morality is also measured on a five-point Likert scale. Rest’s DIT scale depending on Kohlberg’s theory has been used by others to develop many scales to measure ethical behavior. While some of the scales are based on scenarios (Rest et al., 1985; Weber, 1990), other scales use questions (Kelloway et al, 2014; Söderhamn et.al, 2011). The Moral Development Scale for Professionals (MDSP) is one of the scales that has been developed based on Kohlberg’s Cognitive Development Theory and Rest’s scale. The goal of the instrument is to investigate moral development among individuals, which is the goal of this study. Söderhamn et.al (2011) state that “MDSP is an instrument that shows a high degree of construct validity with close correspondence to its theoretical base” (p.170).

The MDSP scale is also used in different settings, and more importantly, in public organizations such as the National Capitol Region in Canada (Kelloway et al, 2014). Its reliability and validity are reported as high. This study adopted this scale because it is easier for the participants to understand and answer than other scales, and it clearly distinguishes between the three moral development levels. It has 10 items divided to measure each of the three levels. There are three items to reflect the self-interest level
such as “The most important consideration in my action is the consequences of the
decision for me personally”. The rules based level is measured by four items such as, “It
is important to follow the law and/or regulations at all times,” and “An action that
violates the law is always wrong.” “It is important to always act with integrity and
virtue,” and “if there is a violation, I would make sure that the violation was corrected, no
matter how far I would have to go” are two of the three items used to measure the virtue
-based level. It has to be noted that the survey has two open questions that allowed
participants to write their comments regarding the concept of emotional intelligence and
ethical behavior.

Ethical climate is a control variable, and it is measured by using an ethical climate
scale developed by Victor & Cullen (1988) used in different studies such as Deshpande’s
studies (1996; 2009). The scale measures different types of ethical climate: professional,
rules, caring, independence, efficiency and instrumental climate and there is one item
representing each type of ethical climate. Explicitly, the item “People were expected to
comply with the law and professional standards” measures professional climate. “The
major consideration was what is best for everyone in the organization” is used to measure
caring climate. While the item “Everyone was expected to stick by organization rules and
procedures” represents rules climate, the item “People protected their own interest above
all else” measures instrumental climate. The items “The most efficient way of doing
something was the right way in the organization” and “Each person in the firm decided
for him/herself what is right and wrong” measure efficiency and independence climates
respectively. Accordingly, the ethical climate scale has six dimensions and there are six
items measure these dimensions. The reliability and validity of the scale is reported as high as .83 to .85.

To measure the perception of peers' ethical behavior, the researcher adopts a scale developed and used by Deshpande (1996; 2009). The scale has four items such as “My co-workers believe that it is okay to by-pass established protocols in order to be more efficient or effective at work” and “My co-workers feel it is acceptable to take office supplies home”. The Cronbach's alpha for ethical behavior of peers was reported higher than .85 in different studies (Deshpande, 1996; 2009).

Leaders' ethical behavior is measured depending on the ethical leadership scale developed by Brown et al. (2005). Many studies have reported that the scale has reliability and validity in different settings which range between .87 to .95 (Brown et al. 2005; Mayer et al. 2010; Walumbwa et al. 2011; Chin-Shan & Chi-Chang, 2013). The scale contains 10 items such as “My supervisor discusses business ethics or values with employees” and “My supervisor makes fair and balanced decisions”. The researcher excluded two items, which are “My supervisor can be trusted” and “My supervisor conducts his/her personal life in an ethical manner”. These items were excluded for the following reasons: 1) these two items are sensitive and might detract participants from participating or cause higher non-response rate; 2) the survey is considered long and that might discourage participants from filling out the questionnaire. Eliminating some items could make a difference.

It could be argued that removing items from a scale can destroy the scale validity; however, there are many scholars who have used scales and omitted items, and they reported high validity and reliability of the modified scale in their studies. As an example,
ethical climate scale is a long scale but Deshpande (1996; 2009) minimized it to six items scale and he reported high reliability and validity of the modified scale in his studies. Additionally, the ethical leadership scale does not measure different dimensions or concepts; instead, it measures one concept, which is leadership behavior. In that case, omitting two items could have no impact on the validity of the scale. In addition, the researcher has tested the validity and reliability of this scale, as other scales used in this study, and found the scale has high reliability of more than .90.

According to the feedback from the experts, two questions have been added to the questionnaire to add more credibility. The first question is “My department ethical standards are”, while the second one is, “My ethical standards are” which is ranked from very low to very high and seven-point Likert scale is used to rank their responses. The survey instrument is provided in Appendix A.

3.6 Validity and Reliability

In simple words, “[a] reliable instrument is consistent and a valid one is accurate” (Fink, 2003, p.47). To ensure construct and content validity of the measures, a two-step design has adopted. First, existing item scales are used because their reliability and validity are reported higher across studies. Using existing scales that are reported as valid and reliable goes beyond saving time and money; it enhances the confidence of the research regarding the reliability and validity of the instrument. The researcher uses Cronbach’s alpha to assess the reliability of the items. According to Hair et al., (1995), and Field, (2005), the value of Cronbach’s alpha should not be lower than 70 to have a reliable scale.
In order to check whether the questions are clear and the scale measures what it is designed to measure (construct validity) as well as whether the items of the scale reflect all the dimensions of the two terms (content validity), these items are administered with a summary of the objectives of the study and its questions to a group of experts. Moreover, the questionnaire is also presented as a pilot study to some of the public administrators in order to confirm the clarity of the questions. Consequently, the respondents were asked for feedback regarding ambiguity and/or confusion among the questionnaire items. The feedback was used to make modifications to the instrument to improve clarity for the actual study.

3.7 Data Collection Procedures

To effectively collect the data, the researcher had to consider many important steps such as:

- Obtaining authorization to conduct the Study

On April 24, 2014, the principle researcher met with the Director of Workforce Planning at MAU. Before the meeting, the researcher sent an email to the director to set an appointment, and the email clarified the purpose of the meeting. During the meeting, the researcher expressed her desire to conduct the study using the administrative employees at MAU. The researcher also explained the purpose of the study, the research questions, why the study is important and what the study might provide to MAU in general and in particular, to the Human Resources Department. The director welcomed the study and sent an Excel file clarifying the statistics of the administrative employees at MAU. She also had the responsibility to get the permission for collecting the data.
• Obtaining Human Subject Approval:

On May 28th, the researcher contacted the Chair of the College of Business and Public Administration Committee for Review of Human Subjects and sent him the exempt application, description of the study, consent statement, the sample email to be sent to participants, questionnaire, and the CITI training report. On August 26th, the research and the instrument were approved. For more clarification, see Appendix B-D.

• Administering the Survey

Fink (2003) states that a pilot test gives the researcher the opportunity to try the instrument before it is distributed to the sample. This allows the researcher to view the ease of completion of the survey and if the directions of the questions are clear and understandable. To do so, a pilot survey was conducted and modifications were made based on the feedback from public administrators before distribution of the survey to the sample under investigation. Then, the survey for this research was administered in an online format. Emails were sent to all of the administrative employees working at MAU with a link to the survey. The link was started with the consent statement that asked the participants if he or she agrees to participate voluntarily or not. If the participants decide to participate, then the survey will be available for him or her to complete, taking approximately 5-10 minutes. Additionally, in order to have more participants, the researcher randomly offered three $50 gift cards during the first seven weeks and one $100 gift card in the last week of collecting the data as incentives for taking the survey. The survey closing page had a link to collect respondents’ contact information to prevent participants from being anonymous for purposes of determining gift card winners. The online survey was implemented during December 15, 2014 – February 20, 2015. The
researcher then made a personal appeal to the administrative employees' offices to collect more responses. On March 2\textsuperscript{nd}, there were 268 valid responses. Chapter four provides more details about sampling and responses.

3.8 Data Analysis

The data from the questionnaire were coded and entered into a spreadsheet and then analyzed with the SPSS statistical package. The descriptive statistics were analyzed first, then the relationship between emotional intelligence and ethical behavior is examined in the second step.

3.8.1 Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive statistics are used to describe the sample regarding their level of education, experience, gender, age, job category and ethnicity. These data allow for testing the significant differences between responses for each of the research variables regarding these demographic aspects. The descriptive statistics also give information regarding the sample size and distribution of each variable, the mean and the standard deviation.

3.8.2 Percentage and Average

The researcher conducted percentage and average to investigate the level of emotional intelligence and ethical behavior. The independent (SEA, OEA, UOE, ROE), and dependent variables were measured using five-point Likert scales. An average was calculated based on the number assigned to each answer. Explicitly, each answer had its own number as follows: Strongly Disagree (1); Disagree (2); Neutral (3); Agree (4); and Strongly Agree (5). The average was calculated using the following formula where \( w \) is
the number assigned to the answer choice and \( x \) is the response count for each answer choice:

\[
x_1w_1 + x_2w_2 + x_3w_3 \ldots x_nw_n
\]

\[\text{Total}\]

### 3.8.3 Multiple Regression

To examine the relationship between emotional intelligence and ethical behavior, multiple regression analyses was computed. Multiple regression is "... an extension of simple regression in which an outcome is predicted by a linear combination of two or more predictor variables" (Field, 2005, p.738). This statistical technique is robust because, as Newman (2003) states, it controls for many alternative explanations and variables at the same time or simultaneously, and it is widely used in social research. Hair et.al (2010) add that multiple regression is a very cutting-edge statistical tool, and it is exceedingly powerful when the researcher aims to explain the changes in the dependent variable or predict a variation of the outcome.

As explained previously, the study has three continuous dependent variables and four continuous independent variables. Accordingly, this statistical tool is appropriate for this study because it examines the relationship between multiple independent variables and one or more dependent variables. Additionally, multiple regression is a flexible technique of data analysis that is applicable whenever there is a quantitative or continuous dependent variable to examine its relationship with other factors or independent variables. Those relationships could be nonlinear, and the independent
variables could be quantitative or qualitative. Applying this statistical method allows the researcher to examine the effects of either one variable or multiple variables with or without concern of the impact of other variables (Cohen, Cohen, West, & Aiken, 2003).

The researcher used standard multiple regression. In doing so, all the independent variables and control variables were entered into the regression equation at the same time. Since there are three dependent variables (levels of ethical behavior), three regression equations were be used based on the following main equation.

\[ Y' = A + B_1(X_1) + B_2(X_2) + B_3(X_3) + B_4(X_4) + B_5(X_5) + B_6(X_6) + B_7(X_7) + B_8(X_8) + B_9(X_9) + B_{10}(X_{10}) + B_{11}(X_{11}) + B_{12}(X_{12}) + B_{13}(X_{13}) + B_{14}(X_{14}) + B_{15}(X_{15}) \]

Where \( A \) is the \( y \)-intercept and \( B \) is the slope and once they are known, the equation is used to predict the value of \( Y \) (the level of ethical behavior) for a given value of \( X \). While \( X_1, X_2, X_3 \) and \( X_4 \) represent the four dimensions of the emotional intelligence (SEA, OEA, UOE, and ROE ), \( X_5, X_6, X_7, X_8 \) and \( X_9 \) represent the control variables (gender, job category, ethical training, perception of peers' ethical behavior, ethical leadership). \( X_{10} \) to \( X_{15} \) represent the six dimensions of ethical climate (efficiency, independence, caring, rules, instrumental and professional climate).

### 3.9 Limitations

The purpose of the research is to investigate the role of emotional intelligence in shaping ethical behavior of the administrative employees working at MAU. To investigate the questions of this research and to accomplish its objectives, the researcher utilized a quantitative approach and survey based research methodology. However, the following limitations of this study are a consequence of its quantitative nature.

This study used a survey with item scales to collect the data from the sample. Those scales are designed to draw out information according to the existing literature.
Subsequently, those scales may not cover all the aspects of emotional intelligence or ethical behavior that the respondents possess. As explained in the literature review section, there are many scales used to measure emotional intelligence. There are also many questionnaires and scales that have been used to examine ethical behavior. This study, however, is limited by the Wong and Law EI Scale (WLEIS) and The Moral Development Scale for Professionals (MDSP) to measure respectively the level of emotional intelligence and ethical behavior within the study sample. The researcher depends on these scales because of their high validity and reliability and their superiority in measuring the two concepts as reported in previous studies. However, this demands further studies to use other scales to compare the results and further examine the relationship between the two concepts.

Furthermore, the survey has closed-ended questions rather than open-ended ones. Using closed-ended questions could limit the participants to giving simplistic answers to complex issues. It could also generate frustration if their preferred answer is not listed among the choices or the choices do not reflect real life (Llieva & Healey, 2002). The researcher used existing item scales with reported high reliability and validity to avoid this problem and relied on a pilot survey to get feedback from respondents in order to modify the questionnaire.

Additionally, the study was limited to an online survey as a means for collecting the data. The researcher has chosen this method because collecting survey data online usually reduces cost since there is no need for copying, labor or mailing in addition to higher response rates and consequently, fewer respondent errors compared with paper surveys (Cude, 2004; Alreck & Settle, 2004). It has to be said that response rates increase
if the questions are accurate (Lyons, Cude, Gutter, & Lawrence, 2003), and this point was considered by the researcher. However, Madden and Rainie (2003) see the data collection process of online surveys comprise biases. That only happens if it is assumed that a portion of the population have no experience with online surveys or internet access. This problem is avoided in this study because the population is the MAU administrative employees, and they have access to their emails and are familiar with internet surveys since they have done many before according to the human resources director.

Cude (2004) states that online surveys could be an obstacle preventing the researcher from calculating response rates; however, it is easy to overcome this problem since the population size is known. The researcher sees the problem of using web-based surveys is that no one is present to clarify questions or control the conditions under which the survey is completed. The researcher assumes that using an existing questionnaire and pilot survey minimizes the possibility of having unclear questions.

The researcher believes there are no unrecognized risks linked with this research study. However, as with any web-based activity, the risk of a breach of confidentiality has to be considered. Therefore, the researcher did everything to the best of her ability to keep participants' answers confidential to reduce any risk. The researcher depended on SurveyMonkey to collect the data. SurveyMonkey uses some of the most advanced technology for Internet safety to provide high security during the transmission of data from the participant's computer to the Web server. The responses are kept in a secured university H drive file and stored in a password protected electronic format. Additionally, the data are kept private and confidential, and no one has access to the data except the researcher. The researcher recorded the data by using labeled codes. All electronic files
including the database, spreadsheets, and other data analysis files are password protected, and the computer hosting those files has a password to prevent any unauthorized access. Additionally, the researcher completed the Collaborative Institutional training Initiative (CITI) to conduct the research, obtained the approval from the Human Subject Review Committee to ensure that the questionnaire has no harmful or inappropriate questions, and will not cause any risk to the participants.

Since the researcher is studying the relationship between the emotional intelligence and ethical behavior within employees working at a higher education organization, the study is limited to the MAU administrative employees as a case study. Stake (1995) states that if the researcher aims to study individuals as the unit of analysis to describe a group of people, the case study is an appropriate method. However, case studies limit the generalizability of this study, and it is considered a threat to external validity. On the other hand, Yin (1994) points out that case studies can open the door for further research, and those studies could be used to predict similar results or to produce conflicting results (Lee, 2006).

The statistical data analysis method has its limitations. The major limitation of all regression techniques is the fact that multiple regression is robust in examining relationships but not used for a causal mechanism (Cohen & Cohen, 1983). For example, a strong positive relationship between emotional intelligence and the level of ethical behavior could be found, but that does not mean that emotional intelligence causes a higher level of ethical behavior. The most likely explanation for this correlation is that the size of the impact of emotional intelligence on the level of ethical behavior when emotional intelligence changes by one unit. Also there are many assumptions that have
to be met before running a multiple regression technique such as normal distribution of the dependent variables, linearity between the dependent and independent variables, homoscedasticity, and reliability (no errors in measuring variables) (Berry & Feldman, 1985).

3.10 Summary

The study investigated the role of emotional intelligence in shaping different levels of ethical behavior. This chapter gave a brief description of the population and the estimated acceptable sample size according to statistical formulas. It also explained the variety of variables used in this study and how they were to be measured. This chapter also clarified which statistical techniques were appropriate to investigate the relationship under study and why. However, this study has its limitations that are evident in the nature of the quantitative approach and use of an online survey data collection methodology, and these limitations have been discussed in this chapter. The next chapter will present the results of the study.
CHAPTER 4
RESULTS

The goal of this study is to investigate the relationship between emotional intelligence as defined by Salovey and Mayer (1993) and the three levels of ethical behavior as defined by Kohlberg’s theory of cognitive moral development. To be more specific, this chapter discusses the answers to the following questions:

- What is the level of emotional intelligence of the case study’s administrators?
- What is the level of ethical behavior of the case study’s administrators?
- To what extent are emotional intelligence and ethical behavior related in the case study?
- What is the relationship between each dimension of emotional intelligence and administrators' ethical behavior in the case study?

The following items will be discussed: results of data analysis including a response summary; preparing the data for analyses; demographics of the participants; participants’ emotional intelligence level; participants’ ethical behavior level; results from the multiple regression analysis to test the hypothesis to determine the existence of a relationship between each dimension of emotional intelligence and each level of ethical behavior; and summary of all results.

4.1 Response summary

Invitations to participate in the study were emailed to 794 administrative employees working at MAU and identified by its Human Resource director resulting in a 25% return rate. The email invitation included an online survey link, and several follow up emails were sent to encourage greater participation. The first email was sent on
December 15, 2014, followed by weekly reminder emails. The last email was sent on February 16, 2015. By February 20th, 210 responses were collected; however, most of the responses were collected in the first week (41%). Even though the researcher offered three $50 gift cards to encourage administrative employees under study to participate, by February 13th, the rate of response was not satisfied as only 200 responses had been received. Therefore, during the week of February 16th, the researcher offered a $100 gift card, but, unfortunately, only ten more responses were received by February 20th.

The researcher used a custom random number generator program to select the participant who won the gift card. This program generates a random number between two numbers. For such an example, in the first selection, there were 86 responses, so the researcher entered number 1 as a lower limit and number 86 as an upper limit and pressed enter to select a number between these two limited numbers. Accordingly, number 24 was selected. Then, an email was sent to the participant number 24 to tell him/her that he/she was selected to be the winner of the gift card. The participant also was asked to provide the researcher with his/her mailing address to which the gift card was to be sent.

Since the analytic sample needed to be at least 266, on February 23rd, the researcher made a personal appeal to the administrative employees' offices and asked them, if they have not done the online survey, to take pen-and-paper questionnaires. Over 150 administrative employees who had not responded were encouraged personally to participate in the study. By March 2nd, the researcher received approximately 86 responses for a total of 296 responses by the end of the ninth week of the data collection period, thus reaching more than the minimum analytic sample required.
4.2 Preparing the data for analyses

4.2.1 Cleaning the data

By March 4th, all the data were coded to start analysis (Appendix E presents how the data were coded). According to the previous discussion, the total number of the responses obtained was 296; however, 50 cases were missing some data. Ten cases were removed because they contained no data (participant chose not to complete survey), and 18 cases were removed because they contained incomplete data (participant ended survey partway through). Twenty-two cases were missing one to three data points and only one data point max per scale. The scale score was calculated based on an average of remaining data points. Some of these cases were missing demographic data; however, these cases were not removed because they fully completed the main part of the survey, the emotional intelligence and ethical behavior scales, and removing them would affect the richness of the data to investigate the relationship between these two main concepts. Thus, the researcher needed these cases to enrich the results and chose not remove them. Accordingly, the total number of the analysis sample is 268 (N=268).

In order to check the outliers, all of the data for emotional intelligence and ethical behavior were converted to z-scores. A frequency was run on the z-scores and 14 data points were found. Explicitly, there were three or fewer cases in each dimension of emotional intelligence (except ROE has 4 cases) that were might be considered outliers. Also there was one case in both rules based and virtue based levels of ethical behavior. However, those cases were not removed for four reasons: 1) the number of the outliers cases in each dimensions of the emotional intelligence as well as in the ethical behavior levels was small (less than 3%) and the researcher thinks that they will not affect the
results, 2) they are valid cases because they answered the main scales 3) removing these cases would eliminate sound data for other variables, and 4) none of those cases is out of tolerance (+/-3.29), 5) and removing them would affect the richness of the data to conduct the purpose of this study.

4.2.2 Testing normality

The distributional properties were checked on the valid data to determine if the assumption of normality was met for emotional intelligence and ethical behavior and other control variables. The distributional properties are shown in Tables 4.1 and 4.2.

Table 4.1

*Descriptive Statistics: Independent Variables: SEA, OEA, UOE, ROE, and Total EI*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>EI SEA</th>
<th>EI OEA</th>
<th>EI UOE</th>
<th>EI ROE</th>
<th>EI Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>4.075</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.476</td>
<td>.589</td>
<td>.600</td>
<td>.595</td>
<td>.439</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>-.700</td>
<td>-.483</td>
<td>-.389</td>
<td>-.637</td>
<td>-.588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>.896</td>
<td>-.039</td>
<td>-.107</td>
<td>1.068</td>
<td>.772</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For emotional intelligence, the skewness and Kurtosis values of each dimension and the total emotional intelligence are almost all within -1 to 1. However, the dimension of regulation of emotion (ROE) has a Kurtosis just over one (1.068). However, 1.068 is not relatively high as it is still close to 1. A high value would be 2, 3 or higher. Since this result is just over the desired range of -1 to 1, it is barely considered non-normal.

Further, Table 4.2 illustrates the skewness and Kurtosis values of each level of ethical behavior and suggests that the data of the dependent variables (levels of ethical behavior) fall within the normal distribution. This is the same for most of the control
variables as seen in tables 4.3 and 4.4. Though there are some of the control variables that could be considered as non-normal such as gender, job categories and ethical training, there is no need for concern as they are nominal/categorical variables (Higgins, 2005).

Table 4.2

*Descriptive Statistics: Dependent Variables: EB Rules, EB Virtues, EB Self, EB Total*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>EB Rules</th>
<th>EB Virtues</th>
<th>EB Self</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>3.138</td>
<td>3.47</td>
<td>2.175</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.631</td>
<td>.668</td>
<td>.768</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>-.263</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>-.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>-.210</td>
<td>-.689</td>
<td>-.626</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.3

*Descriptive Statistics: Control Variables: Perception of Peer, And Perception of Leader*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Perception of Peer</th>
<th>Perception of Leader</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>268</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>3.946</td>
<td>3.438</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.628</td>
<td>.801</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>-.711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>.480</td>
<td>.749</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.4

*Descriptive Statistics: Control Variables: Ethical Climate*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>Ethical Climate – Pro</th>
<th>Ethical Climate – Car</th>
<th>Ethical Climate – Rul</th>
<th>Ethical Climate – Instr</th>
<th>Ethical Climate – Effe</th>
<th>Ethical Climate – Inde</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>266</td>
<td>266</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>M</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>3.54</td>
<td>3.91</td>
<td>3.05</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>2.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD</td>
<td>.685</td>
<td>.856</td>
<td>.732</td>
<td>1.014</td>
<td>.878</td>
<td>.994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Skewness</td>
<td>-.487</td>
<td>-.603</td>
<td>-.836</td>
<td>-.142</td>
<td>-.178</td>
<td>-.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kurtosis</td>
<td>.406</td>
<td>.184</td>
<td>1.418</td>
<td>-.532</td>
<td>-.275</td>
<td>-.901</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2.3 Reliability of the scales

Before running the data, the reliability of scales and sub-scales were tested. Internal consistency of the emotional intelligence and ethical behavior scales and subscales (dimensions) were assessed using Cronbach’s alpha. Cronbach's alpha is a measure of internal consistency because it measures how a set of items are related to each other as a group. As such, it is considered to be a measure of scale reliability (Field, 2005). According to Hair et al., (1995), and Field (2005), the value of Cronbach’s alpha should not be lower than .70 to have a reliable scale.

This study adopted the Wong and Law Emotional Intelligence Scale (WLEIS). This scale has been used in previous empirical studies investigating emotional intelligence and its relationship with different subjects. As noted in Table 4.5, the total alpha coefficient of each dimension are, respectively, .870, .805, .839, .828. Further, the alpha coefficient of each item under each dimension is reported as higher than .70, which indicates the items have high internal consistency. It has to be said that the first item in each dimension, SEA, OEA, UOE, ROE, has the lowest alpha coefficient, which is puzzling; however, those low scores of alpha coefficients of the first items of each dimension did not affect the total score of the alpha coefficient of each dimension. More importantly, the alpha coefficient of the dimensions is considered higher than what other studies have reported. Specifically, in a study conducted by Deshpande and Joseph (2008), Cronbach’s alpha for the dimensions of the emotional intelligence, SEA, OEA, UOE, and ROE, are reported to be, respectively, 0.80, 0.80, 0.80, and 0.85 and clearly these values are lower than what is found in this study regarding the reliability of the emotional intelligence sub-scales.
The reliability of full scale emotional intelligence is reported as .867, which is higher than .7, indicating that the emotional intelligence scale used in this study has high internal consistency and reliability. This result is parallel to the reliability of the scale generated from previous studies that found it to be 0.80 to .090 (Law et al., 2004).

Table 4.5

*Reliability of Scales*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No. of Items</th>
<th>Cronbach's $\alpha$ ($\alpha$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emotional Intelligence Scale</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self Emotional Appraisal (SEA) Subscale</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others' Emotional Appraisal (OEA) Subscale</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilizing Of Emotions (UOE) Subscale</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulation Of Emotions (ROE) Subscale</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical Behavior Scale</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical Behavior Rules Based Subscale</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical Behavior Virtues Based Subscale</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical Behavior Self-Interest Subscale</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Moral Development Scale for Professionals (MDSP) is one scale that has been developed based on Kohlberg's Moral Development Theory and Rest's scale. It has been used in this study to measure the level of ethical behavior of the participants. Its reliability and validity are reported as high at more than .70 (Söderhamn et al., 2011). This study also found the reliability of this scale is relatively high since the alpha coefficient of the total ethical behavior is .746. Moreover, each level of ethical behavior also has high alpha coefficient scores. As reported in Table 4.5, the reliability of rules, virtue and
self-interest based ethical behavior levels are reported as high, respectively, .791, .759, .794. Similar to the emotional intelligence scale, each item under each level of ethical behavior is reported as highly reliable except the first item under each level, which has a low alpha coefficient. The researcher thinks that the participants might have felt uncomfortable or were less conscientious in answering the first item under each level of ethical behavior as well as under each dimensions of emotional intelligence.

Table 4.6 demonstrates the reliability of the control variables. The perception of peers’ ethical behavior scale has relatively high internal consistency since its alpha coefficient is .740. This result is relatively associated with what is found in some previous studies used the same scale such as Deshpande (1996; 2009). Leaders’ ethical behavior was measured using the ethical leadership scale developed by Brown et al. (2005). Many studies have reported high reliability of the scale in different settings which range between .87 to .95. Even though the researcher excluded two items from the scale, the reliability of the scale has been reported as high as .922. Nevertheless, the alpha coefficient of each dimension of ethical climate scale is not high enough to indicate that there is a lack of agreement within the participants according to the type of ethical climate of their organization. This result is different from what other previous studies reported. However, each dimension of the ethical climate (professional, rules, caring, independence, efficiency and instrumental) has only one item, and this one item may not be enough to describe the type of ethical climate and may cause confusion among the participants. It should be noted that the original ethical climate scale is longer, but Deshpande (1996; 2009) minimized it to a six item scale, reporting high reliability and validity of the modified scale; however, according to the result of this study, it is highly
recommended to adopt the original scale that has many items measuring each type of ethical climate to have higher reliability.

Table 4.6

Reliability of Control Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>No. of Items</th>
<th>Cronbach’s alpha (α)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Peers</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Leader</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.922</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical Climate Scale</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>.550</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 Data analyses

4.3.1 Description of the sample

As noted in Table 4.7, of the 268 administrative employees who participated in this study, about 70% are female, and 30% are male. Approximately 24% of them are African-American, 60% are white and 16% are from other ethnicities. The age of the participants range from 18 to more than 70 years old; however, most of the participants’ ages fall into three categories: (35-44 years old); (45-54 years old); and (55-64 years old). Additionally, while there are six participants who are 18-24 years old, there are only two of the participants who are 75 or more years old.

In terms of job category, while about 43% of the participants are classified employees, there are about 30% and 20% are respectively administrative and professional faculty. The majority (52%) of those administrative employees in the sample have 1-5 years experience. There are 25% who have worked at MAU for 15 or fewer years, falling into two categories (6-10 and 11-15 years). Additionally, there are 7% of the participants
who have worked for 16 to 20 years and an equal percentage who have worked for 21 to 25 years. Also, there are about 21(8%) administrative employees in the sample who have worked for more than 25 years. Most of the participants are well educated since there are about 30% of them have college degrees or more and approximately 57% have post graduate degrees.

Appendix F has tables providing additional demographic characteristics related to gender. Of the approximately 69% of the participants who are female, 61% are white, 80% are African-American and 74% reported as other. Furthermore, 101 out of 179 female administrative employees in the sample have worked at MAU for less than six years, and 90% of the participants who have more than 25 years of experience are females. In terms of job category, numbers of female administrative employees are double of the number of male administrative employees in each category. As noted previously, the percentage of female administrative employees is double the percentage of the male administrative employees in the sample, and that explains the dominance of females in most of the categories of the demographic characteristics.
Table 4.7

Demographic Data Distribution of Sample

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>32.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>179</td>
<td>66.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ethnicity/Race</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>157</td>
<td>58.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>African-American</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>23.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>16.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age (years)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>23.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>20.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>21.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job Category</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Classified</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>42.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>22.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>34.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Experience (years)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>52.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>13.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16-20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-25</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25+</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>7.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level of Education</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some High School</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduate</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade, Technical, or</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vocational Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Graduate</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>22.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Postgraduate Work</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Graduate Degree</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>56.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.2 Participants’ level of emotional intelligence

The researcher conducted percentage and average to investigate the level of emotional intelligence and ethical behavior (see Table 4.8 and 4.9). The independent (SEA, OEA, UOE, ROE), and dependent variables were measured using five-point Likert scales. As noted in Table 4.8, participants were able to understand their emotions, desires and motives since the overall average of the self-emotional appraisal (SEA) was more than four. This is high because it means that majority of the participants agreed or strongly agreed regarding the items of this dimension (SEA). Explicitly, there were more than 85% who agreed or strongly agreed that they usually have a good sense of their certain feelings and they have a good understanding of their own emotions. Also, the overall average of the second dimension, others’ emotional appraisal (OEA), is 3.95, suggesting that the participants demonstrate the ability to understand others’ feeling and emotions at a fairly high moderate level. More importantly, the data show that they are able to be sensitive to other’s feeling and emotions beyond knowing and understanding their friends’ emotions from their behavior.

In terms of the ability to utilize the emotion (UOE), about 76% of the participants agreed that they always set goals for themselves and try to achieve them. Moreover, more than 12% of the participants did not see themselves as competent; however, there are about 85% considered themselves as self-motivating, and most of the participants agreed that they always encourage themselves to do their best. Even though the average of some items was below four, the overall average of this dimension was four suggests that the administrative employees under study are reasonably able to utilize their emotions.
Participants demonstrated less ability in regulating their emotions (ROE) as compared with other emotional intelligence abilities. While 15% could not calm down quickly when they were angry, more than 75% were quite able to control their emotions. The overall average is 3.84 indicating that the participants have quiet abilities in regulating their emotions.

In sum, the MAU administrative employees under study demonstrate fair high level of emotion intelligence. To be more specific and according the overall average of each dimension of emotional intelligence, the participants show quiet different intensity in each dimension. They demonstrate high ability in self emotional appraisal (SEA) and utilizing of emotions (UOE) and less in evaluating others’ emotions (OEA) and regulation their emotions (ROE). However, the overall average of the four dimensions is more than four suggesting that the participants have reasonable abilities in understanding their and other emotions and using and regulating their emotions affectively. Simply, they have quite high level of emotional intelligence.
Table 4.8

*Description of the participants' level of emotional intelligence*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self Emotional Appraisal (SEA)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have a good sense of why I have</td>
<td>0.52%</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>5.15%</td>
<td>47.94%</td>
<td>46.39%</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>4.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>certain feelings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have good understanding of my</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1.55%</td>
<td>5.15%</td>
<td>52.58%</td>
<td>40.72%</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>4.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>own emotions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I really understand what I feel</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1.55%</td>
<td>10.88%</td>
<td>53.89%</td>
<td>33.68%</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>always know whether or not I am</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>3.14%</td>
<td>12.57%</td>
<td>49.21%</td>
<td>35.08%</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>happy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scale Average</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Others' Emotional Appraisal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(OEA)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I always know my friends' emotions</td>
<td>0.52%</td>
<td>11.40%</td>
<td>26.94%</td>
<td>50.78%</td>
<td>10.36%</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>3.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a good observer of others'</td>
<td>0.52%</td>
<td>3.09%</td>
<td>13.92%</td>
<td>55.67%</td>
<td>26.80%</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>4.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emotions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am sensitive to the feelings and</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>5.15%</td>
<td>10.31%</td>
<td>44.33%</td>
<td>40.21%</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>4.20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emotions of others</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have good understanding of the</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>5.70%</td>
<td>14.51%</td>
<td>56.99%</td>
<td>22.80%</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>3.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emotions of people</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scale Average</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utilizing Of Emotions (UOE)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I always set goals for myself and</td>
<td>0.52%</td>
<td>7.22%</td>
<td>15.46%</td>
<td>46.39%</td>
<td>30.41%</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>3.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>then try to achieve them</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I always tell myself I am a</td>
<td>1.03%</td>
<td>12.37%</td>
<td>19.07%</td>
<td>40.21%</td>
<td>27.32%</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>3.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>competent person</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am a self-motivating person</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>3.61%</td>
<td>8.76%</td>
<td>53.09%</td>
<td>34.54%</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>4.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would always encourage myself</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1.55%</td>
<td>7.25%</td>
<td>49.22%</td>
<td>41.97%</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>4.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>to try my best</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Scale Average</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Regulation Of Emotions (ROE)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am able to control my temper so</td>
<td>1.55%</td>
<td>3.11%</td>
<td>14.51%</td>
<td>57.51%</td>
<td>23.32%</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>3.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>that I can handle difficulties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>rationally</td>
<td>1.03%</td>
<td>4.64%</td>
<td>17.01%</td>
<td>57.73%</td>
<td>19.59%</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am quite capable of controlling</td>
<td>2.06%</td>
<td>12.37%</td>
<td>21.13%</td>
<td>50.52%</td>
<td>13.92%</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>3.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>my own emotions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I can always calm down quickly</td>
<td>0.52%</td>
<td>3.09%</td>
<td>18.56%</td>
<td>61.34%</td>
<td>16.49%</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>3.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>when I am very angry</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have good control of my own</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>emotions.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3.3 Participants' level of ethical behavior

According to Table 4.9, participants have moderate levels of ethical behavior. In terms of rules based ethical behavior, only half of the participants consider rules and laws as the most appropriate basis for ethical behavior. Moreover, about 60% of the participants did not see an action that violates the law as always wrong even though 68% emphasized the importance of following the rules and law all the time. A similar percentage of those agreed and disagreed about what is right and wrong as defined according to society's laws and organizational regulations. All of the averages of the items measuring the rules based ethical behavior are arranged between 2.49 and 3.69 to generate overall average of this level of ethical behavior as 3.1 suggesting that participants have moderate level of rules based ethical behavior.

The overall average of the virtue based ethical behavior level is 3.48 indicating that participants tend to have moderate level of virtue based ethical behavior. There are more than 97% who believe in the importance of always acting with integrity and virtue and about 83% think that the person has to be always guided by a firm sense of right and wrong. However, 45% of the participants stated that if there is a violation, they would not make sure that the violation is corrected.
Table 4.9

Description of the participants' level of ethical behavior

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Average</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rules Based EB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rules and laws are the most appropriate basis for making ethical decisions</td>
<td>2.89%</td>
<td>19.08%</td>
<td>28.32%</td>
<td>41.04%</td>
<td>8.67%</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>3.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to follow the law and/or regulations</td>
<td>0.58%</td>
<td>12.14%</td>
<td>19.65%</td>
<td>52.60%</td>
<td>15.03%</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>3.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Society's laws and organizational regulations define what is right and wrong</td>
<td>5.17%</td>
<td>25.86%</td>
<td>31.61%</td>
<td>34.48%</td>
<td>2.87%</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>3.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>An action that violates the law is always wrong</td>
<td>10.34%</td>
<td>49.43%</td>
<td>22.99%</td>
<td>15.52%</td>
<td>1.72%</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>2.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Virtue Based EB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If there is a violation, I would make sure that the violation was corrected, no matter how far I would have to go</td>
<td>6.94%</td>
<td>36.99%</td>
<td>29.48%</td>
<td>23.70%</td>
<td>2.89%</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is important to always act with integrity and virtue</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>0.57%</td>
<td>2.30%</td>
<td>43.10%</td>
<td>54.02%</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>4.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One should always be guided by a firm sense of right and wrong</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>1.15%</td>
<td>15.62%</td>
<td>40.70%</td>
<td>42.53%</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>3.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Self-Interest Based EB</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In this world, everyone has to look out for themselves</td>
<td>9.30%</td>
<td>32.56%</td>
<td>22.67%</td>
<td>26.74%</td>
<td>8.72%</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>2.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Each of us needs to look out for number one</td>
<td>12.07%</td>
<td>36.78%</td>
<td>25.29%</td>
<td>21.26%</td>
<td>4.60%</td>
<td>267</td>
<td>2.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The most important consideration is the consequences of the action for me personally</td>
<td>9.77%</td>
<td>36.78%</td>
<td>27.01%</td>
<td>20.69%</td>
<td>5.75%</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scale Average</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Self-interest based ethical behavior level was measured by three items, and the average of each one was arranged between 2.70 to 2.9, indicating that the participants have a low level of self-interest based ethical behavior. About 47% disagreed with the idea that the most important consideration in their actions is the consequences of the
decision for themselves. Also, about half of the participants think that everyone does not have to look out for him/her self or to be number one.

In summary, according to the sample, it could be said that the MAU administrative employees tend to have moderate levels of rules based ethical behavior and virtue ethical behavior with low levels of self-interest based ethical behavior.

4.3.4 Participants' perception of leaders' and peers’ ethical behavior and ethical climate:

Eight items measured how the participants see the level of their leaders' ethical behavior. Table 4.3 shows that participants see their leaders as possessing moderate levels of ethical behavior ($M = 3.438$). Furthermore, participants see their co-workers as possessing moderate to high levels of ethical behavior ($M = 3.946$). A majority of the participants see their organizational ethical climate as professional ($M = 4.10$) while a minority see it as an independent ethical climate ($M = 2.73$), as illustrated in Table 4. Additionally, most participants think that their organization demands them to comply with the law and professional standards, and few of them see that they have freedom to decide for themselves what is right and wrong within their organization. It is found that about 60% of the participants have been exposed to ethical training. Moreover, the participants were asked to rate their ethical standards and their department ethical standards. Accordingly, while about 36% see their ethical standards as higher than their department’s ethical standards, approximately less than 5% see the vice versa; their ethical standards as lower than their department’s ethical standards. However, about 58% see their level of ethical standards as equal to their department’s ethical standards, as demonstrated in Table 4.10.
Table 4.10

Relationship between My Ethical Standards and Department Ethical Standards

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>My ES &gt; Dep ES</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>35.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My ES = Dep ES</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>58.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My ES &lt; Dep ES</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>264</td>
<td>98.5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3.5 Testing hypotheses

To investigate the relationship between the dependent variables (three levels of ethical behavior) and the independent variables (four dimensions of emotional intelligence), the researcher adopted three hypotheses to be tested:

H1: There is a negative significant statistical relationship between the self-interest based ethical behavior level and each dimension of emotional intelligence.

H2: There is a positive significant statistical relationship between the rules based ethical behavior level and each dimension of emotional intelligence.

H3: There is a positive significant statistical relationship between the virtues based ethical behavior level and each dimension of emotional intelligence.

A multiple regression analysis was run to determine if it was plausible to see a change, if there is any, in each level of ethical behavior based on the level of independent variables (dimensions of emotional intelligence) and other various control variables. These independent variables include the four dimension of emotional intelligence: self emotional appraisal (SEA), others emotion appraisal (OEA), the use of emotion (UOE), and regulation of emotion (ROE). According to the literature review, there are many
variables such as gender, job category, ethical training, and the perception of peers' ethical, leaders' ethical behavior and ethical climate that have to be controlled.

There are also assumptions that have to be met in order to generate accurate findings when using a multiple regression technique. As discussed previously, different analyses were performed on the dataset to determine if the data followed a normal distribution and could be used for further analysis. The distributional properties, histograms, K-S tests, box plots, and P/P plots were all computed, and it was determined that there was no need to transform the data, and the data was to be considered normally distributed.

The ratio of cases to the number of independent variables is acceptable, since many scholars emphasize that a sample size has to be no less than \((50 + 8m)\), where \(m\) is the number of independent variables (Field, 2005). In this case, since there are four independent variables and eleven control variables, \(N\) has to be more than 170 to run the multiple regression technique. Accordingly, this assumption has been met since there are 268 responses.

Another multiple regression assumption is that the relationship between the dependent and independent variables is linear. This assumption was examined by using scatterplots of the dependent and independent variables, and it was found that there are linear relationships between them. Residual statistics was examined to assess the assumption of normality, linearity, homoscedasticity of residuals, and it was found that all assumptions were met. To be more specific, in terms of homoscedasticity, the variance of the residuals terms for the emotional intelligence as predictor/independent variables
are constant. The assumption of independence of errors was tested with the Durbin-Watson test, and the residual terms were uncorrelated and, therefore, independent.

Correlation between independent variables was tested and found to be moderately correlated ($<.6/). Additionally, the independent variables are correlated with the dependent variables (three level of ethical behavior). Additionally, the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) statistics confirm that there is no multicollinearity since the tolerance values are close to 1. Field (2013) states that a tolerance below 0.1 indicates a serious problem and a tolerance below 0.2 indicates a potential problem. Additionally, he states that if the largest VIF is greater than 10, there is a cause for concern. If the average VIF is substantially greater than 1, then the regression may be biased. Accordingly, the results generated from this test are considered as acceptable.

At this point, a multiple regression technique was performed on the data to determine the relationship between the dimensions of emotional intelligence (SEA, OEA, UOE, ROE) and the outcome variable (levels of ethical behavior). Also, there are six control variables such as gender, job category, ethical training, perception of peers' ethical behavior, ethical leadership and ethical climate which has six dimensions (efficiency, independence, caring, rules, instrumental and professional climate). There are three main models according to the three ethical behavior levels.

To test the first hypothesis, two models were analyzed: the first model has only the control variables. Then the independent variables were added to generate the second model. As seen in Table 4.11, for model one, $F(11) = 9.748$, $p=.000$; for model two, $F(4) = 2.611$, $p=.036$. The values of $R$ and adjusted $R^2$ throughout the two models indicate that model 2 explains the changes of the self-interest based ethical behavior more than
model 1. Adjusted $R^2$ is .292, which means the model can explain 29.2% of the variance of self-interest ethical behavior level. Moreover, the $p$ value for $F$ statistic is < .05, and this means that at least one independent variable is a significant predictor of the self-interest ethical behavior level. Table 4.12 demonstrates which independent variable this could be.

Table 4.11

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>$R$</th>
<th>$R^2$</th>
<th>Adj. $R^2$</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>$R^2$ Change</th>
<th>$F$ Change</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig. F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.552</td>
<td>.304</td>
<td>.173</td>
<td>.661</td>
<td>.304</td>
<td>9.743</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.577</td>
<td>.333</td>
<td>.292</td>
<td>.652</td>
<td>.029</td>
<td>2.611</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4.12 demonstrates the relationships between the independent variables and control variables and the self-interest based ethical behavior. There are two dimensions (UOE, ROE) that have relationships with self-interest ethical behavior. For the ability of using emotions (UOE) ($r=2.868$, $p=.005$), the regression coefficient indicates that when participants have higher levels of the ability to use their emotions, they will also have higher levels of self-interest ethical behavior. In other words, for every one unit of change in the score of UOE, the total score of the self-interest behavior increases by .260. Additionally, ROE ($r=-2.005$, $p=.046$) has a negative relationship with the level of self-interest ethical behavior. That is for each unit of increase in the score in the ability of regulation of emotion, the score of self-interest ethical behavior decreases by .17. Thus, it
is hypothesized that all four dimensions of emotional intelligence have negative relationships with self-interest ethical behavior, and this hypothesis is significantly partly supported by only one dimension, ROE. Moreover, UOE goes against the hypothesis since its coefficient indicates a positive relationship instead of a negative one.

Table 4.12

*Summary of Standard Multiple Regression Analysis for Ethical Behavior: Self-Interest*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>.412</td>
<td>.550</td>
<td>.748</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.097</td>
<td>.092</td>
<td>-.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job Category</td>
<td>-.052</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>-.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Ethical Training</td>
<td>.161</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td>.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E-Climate-Professional</td>
<td>.127</td>
<td>.074</td>
<td>.112</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E-Climate-Caring</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.058</td>
<td>.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E-Climate-Rules</td>
<td>.065</td>
<td>.069</td>
<td>.061</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E-Climate-Instrumental</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>.049</td>
<td>.305</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E-Climate-Efficiency</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>E-Climate-Independence</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perception of Peer EB</td>
<td>.268</td>
<td>.073</td>
<td>.216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Perception of Leader EB</td>
<td>-.044</td>
<td>.059</td>
<td>-.045</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EI SEA Score</td>
<td>.016</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>.010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EI OEA Score</td>
<td>-.056</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>-.043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EI UOE Score</td>
<td>.260</td>
<td>.091</td>
<td>.202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EI ROE Score</td>
<td>-.170</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>-.130</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Bold Items represent the statistical significant results.*

In terms of control variables, two types of ethical climate have positive relationships with the self-interest ethical behavior. For ethical instrumental climate \((t=4.794, p=.000)\), the coefficient indicates that for every unit change in the score of ethical instrumental climate, the score of self-interest ethical behavior increases by .233.

On the other hand, the other type of ethical climate-efficiency \((t=1.979, p=.049)\), explains
only .1 of the increase in the score of self-interest when the score of ethical climate-efficiency increases by one unit.

Moreover, how participants think about their peers in terms of their ethical behavior is correlated with the participants' self-interest ethical behavior level. The coefficient of perception of peers' ethical behavior (t=3.673, p=.000) indicates that when the score for perception of peers' ethical behavior increases by one unit, the total score of self-interest ethical behavior increases by about .268.

Table 4.13

Model Summary for Ethical Behavior: Rules

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R²</th>
<th>Adj. R²</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>R² Change</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig. F Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.288</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.042</td>
<td>.605</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>2.018</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.354</td>
<td>.126</td>
<td>.071</td>
<td>.595</td>
<td>.043</td>
<td>2.929</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>.022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Ethical Behavior-Rules Score,
b. Predictors: (Constant), Perception of Leader's Ethical Behavior, Ethical Training, Job Category, Gender, Ethical Climate-Effe, Perception of Peer's Ethical Behavior, Ethical Climate-Rul, Ethical Climate-Instr, Ethical Climate-Inde, Ethical Climate-Pro, Ethical Climate-Car,
c. Predictors: (Constant), Perception of Leader's Ethical Behavior, Ethical Training, Job Category, Gender, Ethical Climate-Effe, Perception of Peer's Ethical Behavior, Ethical Climate-Rul, Ethical Climate-Instr, Ethical Climate-Inde, Ethical Climate-Pro, Ethical Climate-Car, SEA Score, ROE Score, OEA Score, UOE Score,

To test the second hypothesis, two models were analyzed. As seen in Table 4.13, the first model includes only the control variables. The independent variables were added to the second model. For model one, $F(11) = 2.018, p=.027$; for model two, $F(4) = 2.929, p=.022$. While the F values for the two models were significant, model 2 had a larger F score than the first model, suggesting that model 2 would be better to explain changes in the level of rules based ethical behavior. Also, the values of R and adjusted R² throughout the two models indicate that model 2 explains the changes of the rules based
ethical behavior more than model 1. The adjusted $R^2$ for model 2 is .071, which means that the independent variables explain 7.1% of the variation in the dependent variable. Further analysis of the regression would confirm this.

Table 4.14 represents the relationships between the rules based ethical behavior as a dependent variable and the four dimensions of emotional intelligence and the control variables. Correlations are all non-significant except for the relationship between regulation of emotions (ROE) and rules based ethical behavior. Explicitly, regulation of emotions (ROE) ($t=2.269, p=.024$) explains the variance in the rule based ethical behavior level. In other words, for every one unit of increase in the ability of regulation of emotions (REO), the score of rules based ethical behavior will increase by .176 after controlling for variables such as gender, job category, ethical training, perception of peers' ethical behavior, ethical leadership and ethical climate which has six dimensions. Thus, the second hypothesis could be accepted partly since only one dimension of emotional intelligence has a positive relationship with the rules based ethical behavior.
Table 4.14

**Summary of Standard Multiple Regression Analysis Ethical Behavior: Rules**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2 (Constant)</td>
<td>1.213</td>
<td>.502</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.417</td>
<td>.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>-.165</td>
<td>.869</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Category</td>
<td>-.037</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>-.052</td>
<td>-.829</td>
<td>.408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical Training</td>
<td>-.011</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>-.008</td>
<td>-.136</td>
<td>.892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Climate-Professional</td>
<td>.093</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>1.393</td>
<td>.165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Climate-Caring</td>
<td>.037</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.051</td>
<td>.691</td>
<td>.490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Climate-Rules</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.063</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.613</td>
<td>.540</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Climate-Instrumental</td>
<td>.061</td>
<td>.044</td>
<td>.100</td>
<td>1.373</td>
<td>.171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Climate-Efficiency</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.125</td>
<td>1.889</td>
<td>.060</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Climate-Independency</td>
<td>.008</td>
<td>.046</td>
<td>.012</td>
<td>.166</td>
<td>.868</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Peer EB</td>
<td>.085</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.086</td>
<td>1.271</td>
<td>.205</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Leader EB</td>
<td>.002</td>
<td>.053</td>
<td>.003</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.968</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI SEA Score</td>
<td>-.017</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>-.013</td>
<td>-.168</td>
<td>.867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI OEA Score</td>
<td>-.032</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>-.031</td>
<td>-.405</td>
<td>.686</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI UOE Score</td>
<td>.114</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.111</td>
<td>1.371</td>
<td>.172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI ROE Score</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>.077</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>2.269</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Bold Items represent the statistical significant results.

Table 4.15 summarizes the differences between the two models examining the relationship between the virtue based ethical behavior level and the four dimensions of emotional intelligence and other control variables. It is clear that the $F$ values for the two models are significant, suggesting each model has at least one independent variable that is a significant predictor of virtue ethical behavior. However, the values of $R$ and adjust $R^2$ throughout the two models indicate that model 2 explains the changes of the virtue based ethical behavior better than model 1. Adjusted $R^2$ is .192, which means the model can explain 19.2% of the variance of virtue ethical behavior.
Table 4.15

*Model Summary for Ethical Behavior: Virtues*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R^2</th>
<th>Adj. R^2</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>R^2</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig. F</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.448</td>
<td>.200</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>.609</td>
<td>.200</td>
<td>5.578</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>245</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.489</td>
<td>.239</td>
<td>.192</td>
<td>.598</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>3.092</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>.017</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Ethical Behavior-Virtue Score.
b. Predictors: (Constant), Perception of Leader's Ethical Behavior, Ethical Training, Job Category, Gender, Ethical Climate-Effe, Perception of Peer's Ethical Behavior, Ethical Climate-Rul, Ethical Climate-Instr, Ethical Climate-Inde, Ethical Climate-Pro, Ethical Climate-Car.
c. Predictors: (Constant), Perception of Leader's Ethical Behavior, Ethical Training, Job Category, Gender, Ethical Climate-Effe, Perception of Peer's Ethical Behavior, Ethical Climate-Rul, Ethical Climate-Instr, Ethical Climate-Inde, Ethical Climate-Pro, Ethical Climate-Car, El SEA Score, El ROE Score, El OFA Score, El UOE Score.

Table 4.16 indicates that there are six control variables that have significant relationships with the virtue ethical behavior level. The coefficient of gender ($t=1.978$, $p=.049$) is .167, which means that the total score of virtue ethical behavior for females is .167 higher than for males. Furthermore, job category ($t=-2.233$, $p=.026$) has a negative relationship with virtue ethical behavior level. When the job categories move from administrative to professional or from professional to classified, the score of virtue ethical behavior level decreases by .1. In other words, for each unit change in the job category (move from administrative to professional or from professional to classified), the score of virtue ethical behavior decreases by .1. Additionally, the analysis indicates that when the participants have ethical training ($t=2.273$, $p=.024$), they demonstrate slightly higher levels of virtue ethical behavior as compared with those who have not been exposed to ethical training. Specifically, the total score of virtue ethical behavior for those who are exposed to ethical training is .186 higher than co-workers who are not exposed to ethical training.
In terms of the impact of the different types of ethical climate, only two types of ethical climates have relationships with or impact on the virtue ethical behavior. As seen in Table 16, the coefficient of ethical professional climate ($r=2.506, p=.013$) is .169, which means that when the score of ethical professional climate increases by one unit, the total score of virtue ethical behavior increases by about .2. For ethical climate-efficiency ($r=2.189, p=.030$), when the score of ethical climate efficiency increases by one unit, the total score of virtue ethical behavior increases by only .1.

It is well known that leaders have influence on their followers, and that is also supported by this model. How participants think about their leaders in terms of their ethical behavior had an impact on the participants' virtue ethical behavior. The coefficient of perception of leaders' ethical behavior ($r=3.065, p=.002$) indicates that when the score for perception of leaders' ethical behavior increases by one unit, the total score of virtue ethical behavior increases by about .2.

In terms of the dimensions of emotional intelligence, there are only two dimensions that correlate with the level of virtue ethical behavior. While UEA ($r=3.030, p=.003$) has a positive relationship with virtue ethical behavior level, OEA ($r=-2.043, p=.042$) has a negative one. Accordingly, for each unit increases in the score of the ability of using and utilizing the emotions, the score of virtue ethical behavior increases by .252. However, when the total score of the ability of understanding others' emotions (OEA) increases by one unit, the score of virtue ethical behavior decreases by .165. Therefore, it is hypothesized that all four dimensions of emotional intelligence have positive relationships with virtue ethical behavior, and this hypothesis is partly supported
by only one dimension, UOE. Moreover, the coefficient of OEA pulls this hypothesis down since it indicates a significant negative relationship instead of a positive one.

Table 4.16

Summary of Standard Multiple Regression Analysis for Ethical Behavior: Virtues

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Std. Error</th>
<th>Beta</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>1.364</td>
<td>.505</td>
<td>2.703</td>
<td>.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.167</td>
<td>.084</td>
<td>.118</td>
<td>1.978</td>
<td>.049</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Category</td>
<td>-.100</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>-.131</td>
<td>-2.233</td>
<td>.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical Training</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>2.273</td>
<td>.024</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Climate-Professional</td>
<td>.169</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>.174</td>
<td>2.506</td>
<td>.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Climate-Caring</td>
<td>.011</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.014</td>
<td>.201</td>
<td>.841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Climate-Rules</td>
<td>-.012</td>
<td>.064</td>
<td>-.014</td>
<td>-.192</td>
<td>.848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Climate-Instrumental</td>
<td>.033</td>
<td>.045</td>
<td>.050</td>
<td>.738</td>
<td>.461</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Climate-Efficiency</td>
<td>.103</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.135</td>
<td>2.189</td>
<td>.030</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Climate-Independence</td>
<td>.010</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.015</td>
<td>.220</td>
<td>.826</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Peer EB</td>
<td>-.043</td>
<td>.067</td>
<td>-.040</td>
<td>-.638</td>
<td>.524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perception of Leader EB</td>
<td>.165</td>
<td>.054</td>
<td>.200</td>
<td>3.065</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI SEA Score</td>
<td>.039</td>
<td>.102</td>
<td>.028</td>
<td>.387</td>
<td>.699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI OEA Score</td>
<td>-.165</td>
<td>.081</td>
<td>-.148</td>
<td>-2.043</td>
<td>.042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI UOE Score</td>
<td>.252</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>.228</td>
<td>3.030</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EI ROE Score</td>
<td>-.025</td>
<td>.078</td>
<td>-.022</td>
<td>-.416</td>
<td>.752</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Bold Items represent the statistical significant results.

4.4 Summary

A survey instrument was administrated to MAU administrative employees by email and then by the researcher in pencil/paper format. Over nine weeks, 268 valid responses with a response rate of 34% were collected. It was found that the MAU administrative employees in the sample tend to have moderate levels of rules based ethical behavior and virtue ethical behavior and low levels of self-based ethical behavior. Moreover, they have quite high levels of emotional intelligence since they have high abilities in self emotional appraisal (SEA) and utilizing of emotions (UOE) and less in evaluating others’ emotions and regulation of their emotions. However, the overall
weighted average of the four dimensions is more than 4, suggesting that the participants have reasonably high abilities in understanding their and others' emotions and using and regulating their emotions effectively.

Results of the multiple regression revealed that some of the four dimensions of emotional intelligence are significantly correlated, either positively or negatively, with different levels of ethical behavior. Even though the first hypothesis states that all four dimensions of emotional intelligence have negative relationships with self-interest ethical behavior, this hypotheses is only partly supported in one dimension (ROE). UOE has also a significant relationship with self-interest ethical behavior, but it is positive. Also it was hypothesized that all four dimensions of emotional intelligence have positive relationships with rules based and virtue ethical behavior; however, these hypotheses are only partly supported. Explicitly, only one dimension (UOE) is significantly positively correlated with virtue ethical behavior while the ability of regulation of emotions (REO) is significantly positively correlated with rules based ethical behavior. Moreover, it was found that others' emotions appraisal (OEA) has a significant negative relationship with virtue ethical behavior which is contrary to what was hypothesized. The next chapter will discuss the results, their theoretical practical impacts, and finally recommendations for future research.
CHAPTER 5
DISCUSSION

The current study examined the relationship between emotional intelligence and ethical behavior. Administrative employees working at MAU were asked to complete surveys that assessed their emotional intelligence dimensions as well as their level of ethical behavior in addition to other various variables. This study adopted three hypotheses to investigate the relationship between each dimension of emotional intelligence and each level of ethical behavior. In the final analysis, however, the proposed hypotheses were partly supported as seen in Figure 5.1. This chapter will discuss in detail the results of this study, the practical implications via a proposed framework and recommendations for further research.

Figure 5.1: Model of the results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable (Emotional Intelligence)</th>
<th>Dependent Variable (Ethical Behavior)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Self Emotions Appraisal (SEA)</td>
<td>Self-Interest Based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others' Emotions Appraisal (OEA)</td>
<td>Rules Based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Emotions (UOE)</td>
<td>Virtue Based</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulation of Emotions (ROE)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.1 Discussion of the results

5.1.1 Participants’ level of emotional intelligence

As discussed in previous chapters, a body of research indicated that emotional intelligence has a significant effect on different aspects of a successful workplace environment such as job performance (Shooshtarian, Ameli & Aminilari, 2013), job satisfaction (Psilopanagioti et al., 2012; Wong and Law, 2002), organizational commitment (Adeoye & Torubelli, 2011; Moon & Hur, 2011), cultural competency (Cherbosque, Gardenswartz & Rowe, 2009), dealing effectively with customers (Yao & Karen, 2009; Ciarrochi et al., 2006), and effectively influencing followers and moving organizations forward (Stanescu & Cicei, 2012; Atieh, 1985). It is not only the private sector that believes in the importance of adopting emotional intelligence in order to build an effective workplace but also the public sector (Deshpande, 2009).

Public administration literature is unique because it has focused on public service. According to Denhardt and Denhardt (2011), the sense of service makes public employees feel more valued and energized. Moreover, there are many claims that the motivations of individuals working in the public service sector vary from others working in different sectors. Public service motivation is a set of motivations that exist in public service organizations (Perry, 1996). On the other hand, emotional labor is a demand in public service since the mechanism of public service delivery necessitates personal communication and exchanges between public administrators and citizens. Furthermore, public service motivation and emotional labor in public service have been examined, and it has been found that public service motivation is necessary in order for public servants’ to possess high levels of emotional labor (Hsieh, Yang & Fu, 2011). More importantly, it
was found that employees with high levels of emotional intelligence tend to express real emotions and have higher levels of desired emotional labor (Grandey, 2000).

There is no doubt that emotional intelligence is a vital component that helps organizations achieve their goals. So, each organization should hire people who have high levels of emotional intelligence and evaluate the levels of emotional intelligence of their current employees. Participants were asked to write down their concerns or comments regarding the concept of emotional intelligence, and many of them stated that they are not able to regulate their emotions and control their anger. While others state that it is hard to understand others’ feelings and emotions, one of the participants said that “as a child, my family tended to communicate that emotions should be hidden. As an adult, therefore, I think I have problems understanding/admitting what I feel”. Moreover, according to the results of this study, the participants showed quite different intensities in each dimension of emotional intelligence. They demonstrated high abilities in self-emotional appraisal (SEA) and utilizing of emotions (UOE) and less so in evaluating others’ emotions and regulation of their emotions.

5.1.2 Participants’ level of ethical behavior

Even though there are numerous studies that examine emotional intelligence and its relationships with other workplace aspects, there are few empirical studies that examine the link between emotional intelligence and ethical behavior, which is the focus of this study. Additionally, most of the previous studies dealing with this subject examined the relationship between ethical behavior and emotional intelligence in general, ignoring the multiple dimensions of emotional intelligence, which encouraged the researcher to examine the multiple dimensions of emotional intelligence in order to
determine which one (s) had a significant impact on the levels of ethical behavior.

Moreover, most of the studies adopted a self-report methodology of unethical behavior, which is considered to be less credible than collecting opinions regarding ethical judgments (Camps & Majocchi, 2010). However, the researcher failed to find any study that used an ethical development scale as used in this study to examine the relationship between the two concepts. In other words, this study adopted Kohlberg’s Moral Development Theory, which is credited for clarifying and rationalizing the fact that people are ethically different in how they think and generate their moral actions and behavior according to three levels. According to this theory, there are three ordinal levels of ethical behavior which are, respectively, self-interest, rules, and virtue based ethical behavior. There is no doubt that any organization desires to have virtuous people who are willing to work hard and help others; however, it could be harder to find individuals associated with the level of virtue than those at the rules based level (Weber, 1993). However, results of this study indicated that the participants have moderate levels of virtue and rules based behavior.

Results of this study also showed that most of the participants have a low level of self-interest based ethical behavior and moderate levels of rules and virtue based ethical behavior. To be specific, only half of the participants consider rules and laws as the most appropriate basis for ethical behavior. Additionally, the majority did not see an action that violates the law as always wrong. The overall virtue based ethical behavior level was found to be moderate. The results show that the majority agreed about the importance of acting with integrity, but about half of them stated that if there is a violation, they would not make sure that the violation is corrected. It is notable that even though the
participants have low levels of self-interest behavior, they do not demonstrate high levels of virtue or even rules based ethical behavior.

5.1.3 The relationship between emotional intelligence and ethical behavior

In terms of the dimensions of emotional intelligence, as seen in Figure 5.1, most of the dimensions are significantly correlated, either positively or negatively, with different levels of ethical behavior. Explicitly, regulation of emotions (ROE) significantly positively impacts, or explains, the variance in the rule based ethical behavior level. In other words, a high ability of regulation of emotions (REO) is associated with a high level of rules based ethical behavior. Thus, the second hypothesis is partly supported since only one dimension of emotional intelligence has a positive relationship with the rules based ethical behavior.

Additionally, it was found that only two dimensions correlate with the level of virtue ethical behavior. The ability of utilizing emotions (UOE) has a positive relationship with virtue ethical behavior level. That is partly consistent with MacIntyre’s (1984) virtue approach that demands high abilities in utilizing and understanding emotions. He thinks that virtue ethics demand a three-fold schema: (1) who I am today; (2) what I have to be; (3) and how to move from where I am towards where I want to be. This approach clarifies that being at the virtue level demands assessing self and others’ emotions, utilizing those emotions and regulating them. Simply, it demands the four dimensions of emotional intelligence.

Furthermore, the ability to be sensitive and understanding of others emotions (OEA) has a negative impact on virtue ethical behavior. However, this result surprised the researcher. Theoretically, as discussed in the literature review, virtue is based on
empathy as a main component. Empathy means the ability to be sensitive to others’ needs and emotions to help them (Mele’, 2005). Empathy is also a vital component under the dimension of OEA, since OEA means the ability to assess others’ emotions, feelings, needs and motives, and that will not be achieved without empathy and being sensitive to others. More importantly, it was hypothesized that all four dimensions of emotional intelligence have positive relationships with virtue ethical behavior, and this hypotheses was partly supported by only one dimension, and the result of OEA goes against this claim. This demands further study in order to replicate and retest this hypothesis.

There are only two dimensions (UOE, ROE) that have relationships with self-interest ethical behavior. For the ability of using emotions (UOE), the regression coefficient indicates that, when participants have higher levels of the ability to use their emotions, they will also have higher levels of self-interest ethical behavior. Additionally, it was found that lower levels of the ability of regulation of emotion (ROE) are associated with higher levels of self-interest ethical behavior. Even though it was hypothesized that all four dimensions of emotional intelligence have negative relationships with self-interest ethical behavior, the results mostly did not support the hypotheses since there is only one dimension that is consistent with the hypothesis. More importantly, having a positive relationship between the ability of using emotions and self-interest ethical behavior could lead to not completely support the hypothesis.

Even though it was assumed that emotional intelligence influences ethical behavior and generates higher levels of ethical behavior that goes beyond self-interest level, the results were not consistent with the hypothesis. It was shown that emotional intelligence could also be associated with the self-interest ethical behavior level. This
result necessitated rethinking about what was hypothesized regarding the relationship
between the two concepts. This could be associated with the idea that emotional
intelligence skills can be used for good or evil as Gibbs (1995) stated. In other words,
individuals can have the ability of assessing their own, as well as others’ feeling,
weaknesses, strengths, and emotions, utilizing those emotions and regulating them to
generate desired actions in order to achieve their own goals, which might be good or not.

It is found in Fue’s (2014) study that the regulation of emotions is the only
dimension of emotional intelligence that significantly impacts ethical behavior, which is
different than the results of the present study. This difference can be attributed to two
reasons: 1) the use of different scales to measure ethical behavior, and 2) the fact that
Fue’s study was conducted in China where the culture is completely different from the
American culture, where the present study has been conducted. This demands further
research to discover the impact of culture on the relationship between ethical behavior
and emotional intelligence.

Many studies have concluded that there are positive impacts and strong
relationships between ethical behavior and emotional intelligence (Deshpande and
Joseph, 2009; Deshpande, 2009; Mesmer-Magnus et al., 2010). Those studies, however,
use unethical behavior scales, not the moral development scale that was used in this
study. This means that emotional intelligence could help in avoiding unethical behavior
or misconducts but might not help explain why some people act at higher levels of ethical
behavior, the level of virtue, while others operate at lower levels of ethical behavior.

According to the Self-Concept Maintenance Theory, people usually strive to
balance between maximizing benefits and having high self-concept. Accordingly,
unethical behavior is a result of maximizing benefits and ignoring of the self-concept. In order to maintain high levels of self-concept, people need to have high levels of self-awareness in order to evaluate their behaviors and avoid the negative ones (Welsh & Ordonez, 2014). In that sense, emotional intelligence might be a good tool to facilitate the process of maintaining high levels of self-concept and avoiding unethical behavior. In fact, emotional intelligence could help employees apply rules and achieve goals, but its relation to the virtue levels still needs more investigation.

It has to be noted that the significant relationships between the dimensions of emotional intelligence and the levels of ethical behavior could be considered as weak since the regression coefficients are small. The size of the coefficients give an idea about the size of the impact of the dimension of emotional intelligence on a particular level of ethical behavior, and most of them are considered as small. However, it cannot be said that the results resolve the basic relationship between the two concepts.

Moreover, it can also be said that there might be other factors that could generate higher level of ethical behavior and affect the relationship between the levels of ethical behavior and emotional intelligence. In other words, to achieve the virtue level, individuals have to plan to intentionally develop themselves, and that cannot happen until they become aware of their ethical level as well their emotional abilities, and then try to adopt new ethical practices to move to higher levels (MacIntyre, 1984). That raises the question about what makes people intentionally want to move to higher levels of ethical behavior while others prefer to maintain their self-concept by avoiding conducting unethical behaviors. This indicates that there are other factors other than emotional intelligence that encourage those people to look for and adopt behaviors in order for them
to be at the highest levels of ethical behavior - the virtue level. Passyn and Sujan (2006) and Hosseini et al. (2010) see the spiritual and religious factors as main components that could enhance the ability to distinguish right from wrong behavior and make people frequently evaluate their behavior and regret their bad actions. Coelho (2010) stresses the importance of personal values in rehabilitating behaviors. Moreover, it was found that public service motivation positively impacts emotional labor which is based on emotional intelligence (Hsieh, Yang & Fu, 2011). That finding turns our attention to the fact that public service motivation could also affect the relationship between emotional intelligence and the virtue ethical level. Further studies are needed. Accordingly, if individuals have the motives to behave ethically at a higher level, emotional intelligence, within those factors and motifs could facilitate and ease the process of being virtuous.

5.1.4 Results of control variables

The analysis conducted of this study also indicates, that when participants exposed to ethical training, they demonstrate slightly higher levels of virtue ethical behavior than those who have not been exposed to ethical training. The participants were asked to write their comments regarding ethical behavior, and some of the participants indicated the importance of conducting ethical training frequently. Additionally, while one of the participants emphasized the importance of updating the training of ethical standards in all departments, another one pointed out that there is a lack of ethical training. Also one participant described workplace ethical training as:

[Having tended] to be oriented to nuts and bolts of compliance rather than ethics. Employees in my workplace are expected to follow rules/protocols but we do try to allow some flexibility to problem solve with customers. Some rules/protocols are essential but others are guidance that allows flexibility.
Also, more than a third of the respondents saw their ethical standards as higher than their departments' ethical standards. Thus, the Human Resources department should update the ethical standards of each department and require effective and frequent training programs that go beyond rules/protocols as well as provide more flexibility to have employees who are able to behave ethically and virtuously. Since the results show that professional and classified employees have fewer abilities to behave at a virtue ethical behavior level as compared to those in the administrative employees category, those employees should be exposed to ethical training that adopts the idea of virtue, and not just rules and dealing with compliance.

It is not only ethical training that is found to be correlated to virtue ethical behavior but also gender. This result is parallel to Feigold's (1994) meta-analysis and Gladue and Bailey's (1995) study that found there are differences between females and males regarding ethical behavior. Whan (2003) also found there is a significant difference since men reported a higher level of readiness to engage in unethical behaviors, unethical competition and compliance more than females, but he thought this difference to be spurious. He states this difference in ethical behavior between males and females could be attributed not to gender, but to a difference in position. This current study found that females demonstrate higher levels of virtue ethical behavior as compared to their male co-workers. Position also could affect the participants' virtue based ethical behavior. As noted previously, employees at higher positions demonstrate quite higher levels of virtue ethical behavior. Since two thirds of the participants are female, it is hard to say that the differences between male and female virtue ethical behavior is because of their positions or gender or even both, and this demands further research.
The results show that ethical climate also has an impact on the different levels of ethical behavior. Explicitly, while ethical instrumental climate correlated positively with self-interest based ethical behavior, professional and efficiency ethical climate are both correlated positively with virtue based ethical behavior, and this result differs from others' studies results. Ma Lu and Zhu (2013) found that care guide, independent judgment guide and rule of law guide are negatively correlated with employees' anti-ethical behavior. They found that a caring climate is the type of ethical climate that could generate ethical behavior. However, Deshpande et al. (2011) found that the rules climate has influenced ethical behavior more than other types of ethical climate. Different results from different studies might mean that there is no particular ethical climate that could enhance the ethical behavior of the employees.

Trevino, Brown and Hartman (2003) state that ethical leaders demonstrate high levels of integrity and that generates trustworthiness. Trustworthiness facilitates more acceptance of the leader's vision. Additionally, ethical leaders could impact the behavior of their followers (Dirks & Ferrin, 2002). Many empirical studies found that ethical leadership has a significant impact on followers' ethical behavior (Chin-Shan & Chi-Chang, 2013; Mayer, Kuenzi, & Greenbaum, 2010; Keselman, 2012). This study also showed that ethical leaders have a positive impact on virtue ethical behavior levels, indicating that when the perception of a leader's ethical behavior increases, the level of virtue ethical behavior among employees increases as well. However, the participants in this study see their leaders as possessing moderate levels of ethical behavior. This underscores the importance of adopting training programs to develop ethical leaders as
well as recruiting persons who are highly ethical into positions requiring skills of leadership to generate ethical employees.

In summary, the previous discussion clarifies the relationships between the two concepts and the factors that could generate higher levels of ethical behavior at the virtue level. It turns our attention toward key points that have to be considered for future research and practice.

5.2 Proposed framework to enhance ethical behavior

This study showed that ethical training, perceptions of leaders' ethical behavior, ethical climate (efficiency and professional) and two dimensions of emotional intelligence (UOE, OEA) are significantly correlated with the level of virtuous behavior. Accordingly, there are many recommendations that can be highlighted for MAU Human Resources department and other Human Resources in other public, large-sized universities as the following:

- Even though there is only one dimension of emotional intelligence (UOE) that positively associated with the virtue level, concerns have to be made toward all dimensions since the four dimensions are related to each other and needed to have high level of ethical behavior.

- Previous discussion concludes that internal motivation such as public service motivation could be a factor that generates the ability to be at the virtue level. In that sense, the Human Resource department should consider that and look for employees who are highly motivated to serve the university community.

- The MAU Human Resource department should consider this difference of intensity of each dimension of emotional intelligence and adopt emotional
intelligence training programs to enhance their employees’ levels of emotional intelligence and lessen the weaknesses at each dimension.

- Even though the participants have low levels of self-interest behavior, they do not demonstrate high levels of virtue or even rules based ethical behavior. This result demands the Human Resource department at MAU to look for ways to enhance their employees’ ethical behavior by conducting ethical training.

- The MAU Human Resources department should consider building a mixed organizational ethical climate that focuses on professionalism and efficiency in which employees are expected to comply with the law and professional standards.

Factors that impact the virtue level of ethical behavior have to be considered in order to develop a framework to enhance the level of ethical behavior among employs. This framework could be adopted by the Human Resource department at MAU to be a guide to enhance employees’ ethical behavior. Thus, there are many steps that could be adopted under each factor as following and seen in Figure 5.2:

1) Emotional intelligence:

   o Adopt an emotional intelligence scale as a tool to be used in selecting and promoting job candidates.

   o Conduct emotional intelligence training and workshops. Those programs should cover all the dimensions of emotional intelligence and focus on the weakness of the participants in each dimension according to the results of their emotional intelligence test adopted for the training program.

   o Conduct a visible emotional intelligence test by putting employees in hard emotional situations and evaluate their actions and decisions. This should be
effective since there is no guarantee that employees will apply what they learn.

- Create a handout that has key points to assist in improving each dimension of emotional intelligence and make it valuable for all employees. Bradberry and Greaves (2009) clarify this point by giving steps to improve each dimension.

For such an example:

- For the self-emotional appraisal dimension, individuals should pay attention to leaning into their discomfort, knowing themselves under stress, knowing who and what pushes their buttons, writing a journal about their emotions, frequently asking why they do what they do, and seeking feedback.

- To improve others' emotional appraisal, individuals should learn about how to know body language, the differences between cultures and understanding the role of the culture, and stepping into others' shoes.

- In terms of enhancing the skills of utilizing emotions, individuals should know how to enhance their neutral communication style, build trust, show care, use the package of what they feel and others feeling in appropriate terms to generate good actions and decisions.

- To regulate emotions, individuals should learn about how to enhance their abilities to handle stressful situations, to soothe their and others feelings, and manage their own and others' emotions in different situations.
2) Ethical training:

Ethical training is important since participants who demonstrate high levels of ethical behavior are those who are exposed to ethical training. To conduct ethical training programs that are effective for the employees, the Human Resources department should consider the following:

- Updating the ethical standards of training in all departments by adopting new ones that focus on not only rules and regulations, but also on how to conduct virtuous ethical behavior.

- Conducting frequent evaluation of the ethical training and the ethical standards of each department by asking employees for their feedback and what they think about the ethical standards adopted and how to improve them. When employees participate, they will feel valued, and they will apply what they learn more effectively.

- Ethical training has to be available for all employees and not exclusive to particular positions. Ethical training can be expensive, but building an ethical organizational culture and enhancing employees' ethical behavior go beyond its cost.

- Using a website that has training and tests. To put into effect, passing those ethical training tests have to be required as a part of the annual performance appraisal.
3) Ethical climate:
   - Build a mixed organizational ethical climate that focuses on professionalism and efficiency in which employees are expected to comply with the law and professional standards.
   - It is vital for human resource practices, policies, and procedures to highlight the value of being an ethical employee or leader in order to generate an ethical climate.

4) Ethical leadership:
   - Human Resources departments should consider the importance of ethical leaders in generating ethical employees in order to move the organization forward.
   - Developing ethical leaders involves:
     - Articulate and embody the purpose and values of the organization (Trevino, Brown & Hartman, 2003)
     - Adopt training programs to develop leaders who have high skills of ethical leadership. These training programs have to develop leaders with high skills who are able to create a conversation with employees about ethics and values (Freeman & Stewart, 2006).
     - Use scales to measure the skills of ethical leadership in recruiting or prompting employees into positions requiring leadership.
Figure 5.2: Proposed Framework

- EI in selecting and promoting job candidates.
- EI training and workshops
- Visible EI test
- Handout that has key points to assist in improving each dimension of EI

- Updating the ethical standards
- Frequent evaluation of the ethical training and the ethical standards
- Available for all employees
- Website that has ethical training and tests

- Mixed organizational ethical climate
- Highlight the value of being an ethical employee

- Articulate the purpose and values of the organization
- Training programs to develop leaders
- Use scales to measure the skills of ethical leadership
5.3 Recommendations for further research

This study indicated that some of the dimensions of emotional intelligence have significant effects on different levels of ethical behavior. Conducting studies with larger samples is important to confirm the results of this study. Furthermore, additional research is needed to validate the findings of this study in similar settings. Since this study was conducted in one of the large-sized public universities, another recommendation would be to conduct a study on a public middle or small sized university in order to compare the results and to have a high level of generalizability.

Previous studies examining ethical behavior and emotional intelligence use unethical behavior scales, but this study used a moral development scale to investigate the linkage between the two concepts. Further research should examine the linkage between emotional intelligence and ethical behavior by using the same scale of ethical behavior adopted in this study, the Moral Development Scale for Professionals (MDSP), but also adopting another scale to measure the concept of emotional intelligence, such as mixed emotional intelligence scale, to see if that generates different results.

Discussion of the results suggests that it might be other factors that affect the relationship between emotional intelligence and the levels of ethical behavior. Those factors could be motivation, religion, spirituality, values and culture. These issues have to be investigated in future studies.

It is found that employees at higher positions demonstrate higher levels of virtue ethical behavior. Since two thirds of the participants are female, it is hard to say that the
differences between male and female virtue ethical behavior is because of their positions or gender or even both, and this demands further research.

Emotional intelligence and ethical behavior are measured by using self-report scales, in which it is hard to capture all the competency of the two concepts. Using emotional situations and recording the participants' actions by video could give a clearer picture about their level of emotional intelligence. Also, using this type of scale on people who are known as virtuous and others who are not to compare how each group deals with different emotional situations to see if there is a difference between them might be considered as another avenue for future study.

5.4 Summary

Callahan (2007) states that to accomplish effective government, public administration scholars and practitioners have to look for solutions to the dilemma of accountability and citizen participation. Both concepts, accountability and citizen participation, need high abilities in managing emotions and acting ethically (Bovens, 2010). The importance of emotional intelligence in the workplace has been supported by numerous studies. However, there are few studies that have examined the relationship between emotional intelligence and ethical behavior. This study investigated the relationship between the four dimensions of emotional intelligence (SEA, OEA, UOE, ROE) and three levels of ethical behavior (self-interest, rules, and virtue based) according to data collected from administrative employees working at one public, large-sized university, MAU.

Results of a multiple regression analysis revealed that some of the four dimensions of emotional intelligence are significantly correlated positively or negatively
with different levels of ethical behavior. This chapter discussed these results in detail and provided a framework that could be used as a practical guide for human resource departments to use to improve ethical behavior in MAU and others organizations. Additionally, according to the results and discussion, several recommendations were highlighted for future research.
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APPENDIX A

SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Please rate the extent of your agreement with the following items using the scale given below:

1 = Strongly Disagree  4 = Agree
2 = Disagree          5 = Strongly Agree
3 = Neutral, neither agree nor disagree

Emotional Intelligence:

1- I have a good sense of why I have certain feelings most of the time.
2- I have good understanding of my own emotions.
3- I really understand what I feel.
4- I always know whether or not I am happy.
5- I always know my friends' emotions from their behavior.
6- I am a good observer of others' emotions.
7- I am sensitive to the feelings and emotions of others.
8- I have good understanding of the emotions of people around me.
9- I always set goals for myself and then try my best to achieve them.
10- I always tell myself I am a competent person.
11- I am a self-motivating person.
12- I would always encourage myself to try my best.
13- I am able to control my temper so that I can handle difficulties rationally.
14- I am quite capable of controlling my own emotions.

15- I can always calm down quickly when I am very angry.

16- I have good control of my own emotions

If you would like to add any comments or information, please write them down:

Ethical Behavior:

17- Rules and laws are the most appropriate basis for making ethical decisions and acting ethically.

18- It is important to follow the law and/or regulations at all times.

19- Society’s laws and organizational regulations define what is right and wrong.

20- An action that violates the law is always wrong.

21- If there is a violation, I would make sure that the violation was corrected, no matter how far I would have to go.

22- It is important to always act with integrity and virtue.

23- One should always be guided by a firm sense of right and wrong.

24- In this world, everyone has to look out for themselves.

25- Each of us needs to look out for number one.

26- The most important consideration is the consequences of the action for me personally.

Ethical Leadership:

27- My supervisor discusses ethics or values with employees.

28- My supervisor makes fair and balanced decisions.

29- My supervisor has the best interests of employees in mind.

30- My supervisor sets an example of how to do things the right way in terms of ethics.
31- My supervisor defines success not just by results but also by the way they are obtained.

32- My supervisor asks: "what is the right thing to do?" when making decisions.

33- My supervisor listens to what employees have to say.

34- My supervisor disciplines employees who violate ethical standards.

**Peers' Ethical Behavior:**

35- My co-workers believe that it is okay to by-pass established protocols in order to be more efficient or effective at work.

36- My co-workers feel it is acceptable to take office supplies home.

37- In order to get ahead in their career, my co-workers believe that one has to compromise personal ethical standards.

38- My co-workers believe that it is acceptable to discuss on occasions aspects of cases with friends and others not employed within their organization.

**Ethical Climate:**

39- People were expected to comply with the law and professional standards.

40- The major consideration was what is best for everyone in the organization.

41- Everyone was expected to stick by organization rules and procedures.

42- People protected their own interest above all else.

43- The most efficient way of doing something was the right way in the organization.

44- Each person in the organization decides for him/herself what is right and wrong.
Circle the number that most closely represents your response:

45- My ethical standards are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very low</th>
<th>Very high</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

46- The ethical standards in my department are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very low</th>
<th>Very high</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 2 3 4 5 6 7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Ethical Training:

47- Have you been exposed to any ethical training before?

- Yes
- No

If you would like to add any comments or information, please write them down:

Demographics:

48- What is your gender?

- Male
- Female

49- What is your age?

- 18-29 years old
- 30-49 years old
- 50-64 years old
- 65 years and over

50- What is the highest level of education you have completed?

- Some high school
- High school graduate
- Some college
- Trade/technical/vocational training
- College graduate
- some postgraduate work
- post graduate degree
51- What is your race?
- White
- African-American
- Other (please specify)--------

52- Including this year, what is the total number of years you have worked in MAU?
- 1-5 years
- 6-10 years
- 11-15 years
- 16-20 years
- 21-25 years
- More than 25 years

53- In your current position, which category do you belong to:
- Administrative faculty who perform the work required to manage educational and/or general activities either in individual educational departments or the entire institution, including all sub-divisions.
- Professional faculty are those who have advanced learning, or specialized work experience such as librarians, and counselors.
- Classified employees or salaried employees whose terms and conditions of employment are subject to the Virginia Personnel Act, Code of Virginia Section. Simply, administrative employees who perform administrative tasks and they are not faculty members.
- I do not know.
APPENDIX B

SURVEY COVER LETTER CONTENTS

This study is doctoral dissertation research conducted by Najwa Mordhah, a Ph.D. candidate at Old Dominion University, Norfolk, Virginia. The study aims to investigate the role of emotional intelligence in shaping ethical behavior. More specifically, this study examines the level of emotional intelligence and its relation with the level of ethical behavior.

Participation in this research is voluntary; you may choose not to participate. If you decide to participate in this online research survey, there will be no negative repercussions if you withdraw from participating at any time. The procedures require taking an online survey that will take approximately 15 minutes. The survey contains two parts: 1- Two scales to measure levels of emotional intelligence and ethical behavior, and 2- Demographic questions to describe the sample of the research.

Your response will be confidential and no identifying information will be solicited. Only aggregate data will be reported and no individual will be identified. To protect your confidentiality, the survey has no information that will personally identify you. The study and its results will be used only for scholarly purposes. The researcher believes there are no recognized risks linked with this research study; however, as with any web-based activity, the risk of a breach of confidentiality has to be considered. In that case, the researcher will, to the best of her ability, keep your answers confidential to reduce any risks. Your responses will be kept and stored in a password protected electronic format. Additionally, the data will be kept private and confidential and no one will have access to the data except the researcher. All electronic responses will be password protected and the computer hosting those files will have a password to prevent any unauthorized access.

After completing the survey, you will be redirected to a separate page and asked if you would like to be entered for the chance to win one of five $50 Visa gift cards. A random drawing will be held every week for the duration of the survey; the earlier you complete the survey, the more chances you have to win. The separate entry from the page is not connected to your survey responses and the winners will be contacted via email.

If you have questions regarding this study, please contact me at (217) 819-6585, or my you could contact my advisor, William Leavitt at wleavitt@odu.edu or (757) 683-3961

This research has been reviewed according to IRB procedures for research involving human subjects. If you have any questions concerning your rights as a research participant that I can’t answer you may contact Kenneth Yung, Chair of Human Subject Review Committee in my college, at (757) 683-4048 or kyung@odu.edu.

Clicking on the "agree" button below indicates that:

- You have read the above information
- You voluntarily agree to participate
- You are at least 18 years of age

○ Agree
○ Disagree
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APPROVAL CERTIFICATE

Certificate of Approval

Date: August 29, 2014

Responsible Project Investigator (PI): William Leavitt

Co-Investigator: Najwa Mordah

Proposal Number: 37

Effective Date: September 1, 2014

Exemption Category: 6.2

Title: The Role of Emotional Intelligence in Shaping Ethical Behavior

All approved investigators must comply with the following:

- For the duration of your protocol, any change in the experimental design/Consent and/or Assent Form must be approved by the HSRC before implementation of the changes.

- The Principal Investigator bears the responsibility for obtaining from all subjects “Informed Consent” as approved by the HSRC. The HSRC requires that the subject be given a copy of the Consent and/or Assent Form. Consent and/or Assent Forms must include the name and the telephone number of the Principal Investigator.

- Provide non-English speaking subjects with a certified translation of the approved Consent and/or Assent Form in the subject’s first language.

- The Principal Investigator also bears the responsibility for informing the HSRC immediately of any unanticipated problems that are unexpected and related to the study.

- Obtain HSRC approval for all advertisements, questionnaires, and surveys before use.

Any questions can be referred to the College of Business and Public Administration’s Human Subjects Review Committee (HSRC) Chair at 757-683-5109 or irbcbpa@odu.edu

Sincerely,

Kenneth Yung
CBPA HSRC Chair
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CITI TRAINING REPORT

COLLABORATIVE INSTITUTIONAL TRAINING INITIATIVE (CITI PROGRAM)
COURSEWORK TRANSCRIPT REPORT**

** NOTE: Scores on this Transcript Report reflect the most current quiz completions, including quizzes on optional (supplemental) elements of the course. See list below for details. See separate Requirements Report for the reported scores at the time all requirements for the course were met.

- Name: Najwa Mordheh (ID: 2312189)
- Email: nmord001@odu.edu
- Institution Affiliation: Old Dominion University (ID: 1771)
- Institution Unit: PA
- Curriculum Group: Social & Behavioral Research - Basic/Refresher
- Course Learner Group: Same as Curriculum Group
- Stage: Stage 1 - Basic Course
- Description: Choose this group to satisfy CITI training requirements for Investigators and staff involved primarily in Social/Behavioral Research with human subjects.

- Report ID: 14961598
- Report Date: 03/25/2015
- Current Score**: 91

REQUIRED, ELECTIVE, AND SUPPLEMENTAL MODULES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Module</th>
<th>MOST RECENT</th>
<th>SCORE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Students in Research (ID:1321)</td>
<td>01/15/15</td>
<td>8/10 (80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>History and Ethical Principles - SBE (ID:490)</td>
<td>01/15/15</td>
<td>4/5 (80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defining Research with Human Subjects - SBE (ID:491)</td>
<td>01/15/15</td>
<td>5/5 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belmont Report and CITI Course Introduction (ID:1127)</td>
<td>01/15/15</td>
<td>3/3 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Federal Regulations - SBE (ID:502)</td>
<td>01/15/15</td>
<td>5/5 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessing Risk - SBE (ID:503)</td>
<td>01/15/15</td>
<td>4/5 (80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informed Consent - SBE (ID:504)</td>
<td>01/15/15</td>
<td>4/5 (80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privacy and Confidentiality - SBE (ID:505)</td>
<td>01/15/15</td>
<td>5/5 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research with Prisoners - SBE (ID:506)</td>
<td>01/15/15</td>
<td>4/5 (80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research with Children - SBE (ID:507)</td>
<td>01/15/15</td>
<td>5/5 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research in Public Elementary and Secondary Schools - SBE (ID:508)</td>
<td>01/15/15</td>
<td>4/5 (80%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>International Research - SBE (ID:509)</td>
<td>01/15/15</td>
<td>5/5 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Internet-Based Research - SBE (ID:510)</td>
<td>01/15/15</td>
<td>5/5 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Research and HIPAA Privacy Protections (ID:14)</td>
<td>01/15/15</td>
<td>5/5 (100%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conflicts of Interest in Research involving Human Subjects (ID:488)</td>
<td>01/15/15</td>
<td>5/5 (100%)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For this Report to be valid, the learner identified above must have had a valid affiliation with the CITI Program subscribing Institution identified above or have been a paid Independent Learner.

CITI Program
Email: citisupport@citipirn.org
Phone: 305-243-7970
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SUMMARY OF CODED DATA

1 = Strongly Disagree  4 = Agree
2 = Disagree  5 = Strongly Agree
3 = Neutral, neither agree nor disagree

Emotional Intelligence:
- I have a good sense of why I have certain feelings most of the time. (SEA1)
- I have good understanding of my own emotions. (SEA2)
- I really understand what I feel. (SEA3)
- I always know whether or not I am happy. (SEA4)
- I always know my friends’ emotions from their behavior. (OEA1)
- I am a good observer of others’ emotions. (OEA2)
- I am sensitive to the feelings and emotions of others. (OEA3)
- I have good understanding of the emotions of people around me. (OEA4)
- I always set goals for myself and then try my best to achieve them. (UOE1)
- I always tell myself I am a competent person. (UOE2)
- I am a self-motivating person. (UOE3)
- I would always encourage myself to try my best. (UOE4)
- I am able to control my temper so that I can handle difficulties rationally. (ROE1)
I am quite capable of controlling my own emotions. (ROE2)

I can always calm down quickly when I am very angry. (ROE3)

I have good control of my own emotions. (ROE4)

**Ethical Behavior:**

- Rules and laws are the most appropriate basis for making ethical decisions and acting ethically. (EB-Rules1)
- It is important to follow the law and/or regulations at all times. (EB-Rules2)
- Society's laws and organizational regulations define what is right and wrong. (EB-Rules3)
- An action that violates the law is always wrong. (EB-Rules4)
- If there is a violation, I would make sure that the violation was corrected, no matter how far I would have to go. (EB-Virtue1)
- It is important to always act with integrity and virtue. (EB-Virtue2)
- One should always be guided by a firm sense of right and wrong. (EB-Virtue3)
- In this world, everyone has to look out for themselves. (EB-Self1)
- Each of us needs to look out for number one. (EB-Self2)
- The most important consideration is the consequences of the action for me personally. (EB-Self3)

**Ethical Leadership:**

- My supervisor discusses ethics or values with employees. (Leader-EB1)
- My supervisor makes fair and balanced decisions. (Leader-EB2)
- My supervisor has the best interests of employees in mind. (Leader-EB3)
- My supervisor sets an example of how to do things the right way in terms of ethics. (Leader-EB4)
o My supervisor defines success not just by results but also by the way they are obtained. (Leader-EB5)

o My supervisor asks: "what is the right thing to do?" when making decisions. (Leader-EB5)

o My supervisor listens to what employees have to say. (Leader-EB7)

o My supervisor disciplines employees who violate ethical standards. (Leader-EB8)

**Peers' Ethical Behavior:**

o My co-workers believe that it is okay to by-pass established protocols in order to be more efficient or effective at work. (Peer-EB1)

o My co-workers feel it is acceptable to take office supplies home. (Peer-EB2)

o In order to get ahead in their career, my co-workers believe that one has to compromise personal ethical standards. (Peer-EB3)

o My co-workers believe that it is acceptable to discuss on occasions aspects of cases with friends and others not employed within their organization. (Peer-EB4)

**Ethical Climate:**

o People were expected to comply with the law and professional standards. (Ethical Climate-Pro)

o The major consideration was what is best for everyone in the organization. (Ethical Climate-Car)

o Everyone was expected to stick by organization rules and procedures. (Ethical Climate-Rul)
- People protected their own interest above all else. (Ethical Climate-Instr)
- The most efficient way of doing something was the right way in the organization. (Ethical Climate-Effe)
- Each person in the organization decides for him/herself what is right and wrong. (Ethical Climate-Inde)

**Ethical training:**
- Yes=1
- No=0

**Gender:**
- Female = 1
- Male = 0

**Race:**
- White = 1
- African American = 2
- Other = 3

**Education:**
- Some high school= 1
- High school graduate= 2
- Some college= 3
- Trade/technical/vocational training= 4
- College graduate= 5
- Some postgraduate work= 6
- Post graduate degree= 7

**Experience**
- 1-5 years= 1
- 6-10 years= 2
- 11-15 years= 3
- 16-20 years= 4
- 21-25 years= 5
- More than 25 years= 6
Age:

- 18-24 years old = 1
- 25-34 years old = 2
- 35-44 years old = 3
- 45-54 years =4
- 55-64 years =5
- 65-74 years =6
- 75 years and more = 7

Position:

- Administrative = 1
- Professional = 2
- Classified = 3
- I don’t Know = 0
# APPENDIX F

## ADDITIONAL DEMOGRAPHIC TABLES

Table F1

*Experience by Gender*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience by Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>1-5 Years</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>72.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>6-10 Years</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>41.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>58.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>11-15 Years</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>57.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>16-20 Years</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>61.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>21-25 Years</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>25+ Years</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>90.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table F2

*Job Category by Gender*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Classified</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>33.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>19</td>
<td>31.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29</td>
<td>31.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>63</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table F3

*Level of Education by Gender*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High School Graduate</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>90.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some College</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>72.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trade/Technical/Vocational</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College Graduate</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>42.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>57.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some Postgraduate Work</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>59.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Graduate Degree</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>29.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>70.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table F4

*Age by Gender*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>18-24 Years</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25-34 Years</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>31.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>69.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35-44 Years</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>35.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>64.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-54 Years</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>25.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>74.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55-64 Years</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>63.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65-74 Years</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>63.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75+ Years</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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