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Society has experienced an increasing number of ethical and moral scandals over the past decades and as a result, has called for an increase in the teaching of ethical and moral leadership within educational institutions. This study sought to determine how faculty teach ethical and moral leadership, specifically, what instructional methods they perceive to be effective for teaching ethical and/or moral leadership within undergraduate courses. For this study, a population of faculty within colleges of agriculture was used.

Participants were administered a researcher-designed survey that measured four specific constructs. The four constructs consisted of: what instructional methods faculty members perceive to be effective for teaching ethical and/or moral leadership principles, what instructional methods faculty members perceive to be effective for teaching ethical and/or moral leadership behaviors, demographic characteristics and lastly, faculty members’ definitions of the terms “ethics” and “morals” when judging student behaviors.

This study found that when teaching ethical and/or moral leadership principles, faculty members perceive instructor-led discussion, traditional lecture, and activities to
be most effective. When teaching ethical and/or moral leadership behaviors, faculty members perceive instructor-led discussion and activities to be most effective. Related to demographic information, a key finding was that the majority of participants attend/practice religious services 4-10 times per month and thus, may be better enabled to educate their students on ethical and/or moral leadership. Lastly, faculty members do not have a consistent, clear understanding of the terms “ethics” and “morals” and they perceive their students’ individual cognitive moral development to drastically increase as a direct result of their instructional methods.
CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

Background

Society has seen an ever-increasing decline in the ethical and moral behavior of its leaders over the past few decades. The now infamous scandals and poor leadership behavior of Enron, Arthur Andersen, Martha Stewart, and of late, the Yahoo! Chief Executive Officer, Scott Thompson, and former CIA Director, General David Petraeus, have all contributed to the decline and to society’s concerns about the integrity and “role of leadership in shaping ethical conduct” (Brown, Treviño, & Harrison, 2005, p. 117). These scandals have become increasingly outrageous in terms of frequency, magnitude, and scope of negative impact on individuals, communities, and society as a whole. Ethical scandals, such as those mentioned above, have led to corporate investigations, research on the ethical and moral behavior of business leaders, demands for justice, and of most importance to this study, action from educational institutions in preparing sound ethical and moral leaders for society.

In a study conducted by The Conference Board, Corporate Voices for Working Families, Partnership for 21st Century Skills, and the Society for Human Resource Management (2006), employers were asked to rank “very important” skills related to workforce readiness. Among the top ten “very important” applied skills were “ethics/social responsibility” (Casner-Lotto, Barrington, & Wright, 2006, p. 9). The report concluded with a Workforce Readiness Report Card which showed that two-year college graduates were deficient in many applied skills, ethics and social responsibility included (Casner-Lotto et al., 2006). As the report showed, college graduates are lacking in their ability to apply ethics and social responsibility skills – skills deemed “very
important” by employers. Society in general has also deemed these skills important, as reflected in a report by Eisner (2010), where 62 percent of U.S. voters cited ethics and social responsibility as very important for today’s students. Additionally, unethical behavior was listed as the most employer-identified attribute for top reasons new college graduates are fired (Casner-Lotto & Silvert, 2008). The overall survey results published by The Conference Board, et. al., indicated “that far too many young people are inadequately prepared to be successful in the workplace” (Casner-Lotto et al., 2006, p. 7). Perhaps the results of the report do not come as a surprise as society has seen the widespread repercussions of graduates who have lacked the ethical skills required for leadership positions (Alsop, 2003).

**Educational Institutions Responsibility**

Facing scrutiny from the press, corporations, and society for not preparing ethically and morally sound leaders, not valuing ethics, and after accusations of being just as blameworthy as the wrong-doers (Alsop, 2003; Ghosal, 2003; Willen, 2004), educational institutions have begun to take a closer look at how ethics and morals play a role in their curriculum and what steps they can take to ensure those skills are taught to students. Liddell and Cooper (2012) noted that, “recent events and public debate have renewed the focus of higher education toward a consideration of moral development as an anticipated outcome of college attendance” (p. 5). This had led to a new emphasis on ethical coursework as many research scholars have noted (Bazerman & Gino, 2012; Canales, Massey, & Wrzesniewski, 2010; Clayton, 1999; Merritt, 2003; Pennington, 2006; Peppas & Diskin, 2001; Sims & Sims, 1991). Plinio (2009) noted that “The ethical missteps and meltdowns that fill the media have driven ethical leadership toward the top of national and international agendas” (p.278).
Many educational institutions have been pressed to change their priorities and conscientiously make ethics and morals a part of their agendas as well, which according to Normore (2004), should have always remained the top priority of those agendas. “Traditionally, schools have been thought of as places where diverse values are respected and taught” (Normore, 2004, p. 4). Similarly, Sims & Felton (2005) concluded that if higher education faculty members do not attempt to change their priorities, “then they should honestly say that making it possible for students to learn ethics and to keep on learning in general is not on the top of their agendas” (p. 46). Sims and Sims (1991) reinforced this view of universities’ roles: “In addition, the college was considered to have a special and leading role to perform in the shaping of societal ethics, national goals and values, and therefore, it should be the logical location for ethics and value teaching” (p. 214). Scholars and researchers have supported this viewpoint (Alsop, 2003; Sims & Felton, 2005). Whiteley (2002) noted that this historic perspective of institutional responsibilities is also applicable to the “modern university”: “one of the fundamental obligations of the modern college and university is to influence intentionally the moral thinking and action of the next generation of society’s leaders and citizens” (p. 5).

Leadership Instruction in Colleges of Agriculture

Universities have been working hard to meet those perceptions of their responsibilities through what has become a public, and somewhat transparent, lens of the inner-workings and course offerings of universities (Alsop, 2003). Though many of the aforementioned ethical scandals have occurred in the business world of management and corporate governance, much of the root of the problem has been traced back to those offenders who have largely been educated within our country’s
leading business schools, such as the Yale University’s School of Management (Ghosal, 2003). As a result, much of the research and mentioned emphasis on ethics education relating to leadership has stemmed from business schools or business-related journals.

However, leadership education of our society’s leaders does not just occur within the realms of Ivy League business schools. Many leadership programs are housed within other colleges, departments, or academic units. Learning leadership skills should not be reserved solely for corporate managers and business gurus. As the report published by Corporate Voices for America (2010), stated, leadership is another applied skill in which college graduates are deficient. This report suggested that the teaching of leadership, namely ethical leadership, should not be confined to business schools, but rather included in all academic units. Sims and Sims (1991) hinted that reserving ethics education for business schools alone would not ensure an even distribution of ethically sound leaders for society and its organizations. “In recent years, however, many advocates of teaching ethics have suggested that ethics courses should not only be included in business curricula but also in other undergraduate and professional curricula at colleges and universities” (Sims & Sims, 1991, p. 211).

Colleges of agriculture are examples of academic units that have traditionally taught leadership. As such, colleges of agriculture may be overdue for including ethics and morals education into their curriculum, as Murphy and Townsend (1994) suggested in their recommendations section of a study analyzing the important relationship between leadership and ethics. “However, the aforementioned results would suggest a need for the recognition of the relationship between ethics and leadership within the
agricultural community” (Murphy & Townsend, 1994, p.49). Just as other educational units hope to resolve the concerns of ethical leadership in society, so does agricultural education. “If agricultural education hopes to abate the current negative trends in agriculture, they must begin to recognize the relationship between agricultural leadership and ethical responsibility” (Murphy & Townsend, 1994, p. 49).

Current research (Pennington, 2006) has suggested that colleges of agriculture may be beginning to address ethics in their leadership courses. As noted by Pennington (2006), Oklahoma State University’s Agricultural Leadership curriculum is focused on values-based curriculum, with “ethical leadership” being one of the course topics in a recently established (2005) required course entitled “Contemporary Issues in Leadership” (p. 44). One of the five core values of this new course is authentic leadership (Pennington, 2006), which, as stated by Avolio, Luthans, and Walumbwa (2004), includes “moral character” in its definition. The establishment of leadership courses with an ethical component, such as the course mentioned above, has shown that colleges of agriculture are interested in pursuing ethical and moral leadership education.

**Teaching Ethical and Moral Leadership Principles and Behaviors**

As various departments work to recognize the mentioned relationship between ethics, morals, and leadership by including ethical/moral coursework or leadership training into their programs, a larger question has surfaced: What are the most effective ways to teach ethical leadership to ensure graduates will be ethically and morally sound leaders for the future? Several opinions have formed on this topic, and the small amount of research that has been conducted seems to have offered mixed conclusions, as researchers Dean & Beggs (2006) and Peppas and Diskin (2001) noted. “A review of
the literature examining whether college-level ethics courses, and/or courses in which ethics is incorporated into course content, have an impact on attitudes toward ethics shows that the results of the studies are mixed” (Peppas & Diskin, 2001, p. 348).

Included in the debate over how to best teach ethics and morals in leadership have been issues of whether or not ethics should be integrated into departmental or college-wide curricula, or if ethics should be taught as a stand-alone course (Alsop, 2003; Murray, 2004); the disconnect between ethics and leadership (Canales, et al., 2010); how best to teach ethical leadership (Reeves, 2002); ethical frameworks to use (Oddo, 1997; Begley & Stefkovich, 2007); determining effective pedagogical approaches (Dean & Beggs, 2006); and different learning theory bases for ethical leadership curriculum (social learning theory, experiential learning, etc.) (Murray, 2004, Wilcox & Ebbs, 1992).

Some of the aforementioned issues have been visible even to the public eye, such as a disconnect between ethics and leadership, as illustrated in a Wall Street Journal report by Canales, et al. (2010). “Leadership courses tend to emphasize such things as social influence and public speaking, while ethics courses often focus on legal aspects. This leaves the connection between values, leadership and action underdeveloped” (Canales, et al., 2010). Dean and Beggs (2006) also noted a disconnect, albeit a different one. In their future research section, Dean and Beggs (2006) implied that the need for more research is apparent from the disconnect between educational institutions and corporate America. “There is a disconnect between instructors’ own approaches to teaching ethics and what the business world thinks, or more important, hopes is happening in our classrooms” (p. 41).
Academia could work to resolve the noted disconnect by taking a broader view of ethics, as suggested in Sims and Felton’s (2005) conclusion. “We must begin to look at our academic disciplines in fresh ways. How do our different fields look at ethics?” (Sims & Felton, 2005, p. 46). By doing so, inter-departmental and inter-collegiate collaboration could spur research scholars and faculty alike to build knowledge-retaining leadership programs that emphasize ethical and moral actions in leadership positions. This idea of collaboration between different academic units is not new. Scholars such as Oddo (1997) have suggested that these “joint ventures” could be a step in the right direction in order to better understand how to teach ethics and morals in leadership.

Additionally, Alsop (2003) indicated a lack of research and agreement amongst faculty on how best to teach ethics. “Academics disagree on the ideal approach to embedding ethics in the curriculum. Should schools require students to take courses focused primarily on ethical responsibilities? Or is it better to sprinkle ethics lessons throughout all of the major courses . . . ?” (Alsop, 2003, p. 3). Questions such as those presented focus on the best interests of the students and their future responsibilities and not on the best interests of the department or college as suggested by Ghosal (2003).

The need for more research in this area is pressing, and the effects of academic institutions not effectively educating students on ethics and morals and effective leadership can no longer be ignored (Zimdahl, 2000). “Concerns about ethics and leadership have dominated recent headlines about business and shaken public confidence in many organizations. Now, more than ever, rigorous systematic research on ethical leadership is needed” (Brown, Treviño, & Harrison, 2005, p.132). As ethical
scandals and immoral leaders continue to plague our society with unethical actions, more research is needed to formulate solutions to the questions presented above and to bridge the gap between age-old theories and effective application. More research is also needed on how to effectively teach ethics and ethical leadership (Brown & Treviño, 2006; Brown, Treviño, & Harrison, 2005; Peppas & Diskin, 2001, Sims & Felton, 2005).

Problem Statement

Employers and society in general have been seeking more ethically and morally sound leaders in response to the ethical scandals that have continued to weaken our society’s strong leadership foundation. The problem has been twofold: increasing unethical and immoral leadership behavior in our society, and a lack of knowledge and competency on how ethical and moral leadership knowledge and behavior can be effectively taught. Canales, et al. (2010) suggested that by universities reclaiming their role as places of moral scholarship and ethics in congruence with leadership development could have a dramatic positive impact on society’s leaders. Though research in ethics and leadership is expanding, there are still many gaps to be filled of what educators and stakeholders know about ethics, morals, and leadership and how to teach those in a manner where it is encouraged and allowed for application in a real world setting. Peppas and Diskin (2001), along with other scholars (Murray, 2004; Reeves, 2002) noted that more research is needed on different approaches to teaching ethics: “future researchers may wish to gather additional empirical evidence in terms of the effects of different ways of teaching ethics” (p. 351). Measuring faculty perceptions of effective teaching methods for ethical and moral leadership could help clear misconceptions, bridge disconnects, and in turn, help to resolve the problem of unethical leaders in the 21st century.
Purpose and Objectives

The purpose of this study was to determine faculty perceptions of methods for teaching ethical and moral leadership principles and behaviors in undergraduate college of agriculture courses. Although a growing field of research, it has still been in its infancy. Research objectives of this study included:

- Objective 1: To identify effective methods for developing student knowledge of ethical and moral leadership principles as reported by college of agriculture faculty.
- Objective 2: To identify effective methods for developing student knowledge of ethical and moral leadership behaviors as reported by college of agriculture faculty.
- Objective 3: To determine the demographic characteristics of faculty who teach ethical and moral leadership in colleges of agriculture.
- Objective 4: Identify faculty members’ perceptions of the terms “ethics” and “morals” and determining student behaviors.

Significance of the Problem

A clear societal need for more ethically and morally sound leaders exists (Casner-Lotto et al., 2006; Reeves, 2002). More effective instruction in college classrooms has been identified as one avenue to strengthen the preparation of ethical and moral leaders in the public and private sector (Canales, et al, 2010; Reeves, 2002; Sims & Sims, 1991; Willen, 2004). This study will help to fulfill that need by examining how ethics and morals are effectively taught in college of agriculture courses. Information from this study can be used to improve existing leadership programs and to create a starting point for fledgling leadership programs or institutions that wish to offer ethics and morals in a leadership curriculum but who seek guidance on where to begin.

Stakeholders who can specifically benefit from this study include collegiate educators, especially university faculty who teach leadership courses that include an
ethics and moral leadership component. Such individuals will be better able to understand how to best teach ethics and morals as related to leadership by insights provided from this study. The findings of this study could help, in part, to transform ethics and morals in leadership curricula and provide evidence on specific effective teaching methods, which in turn, may transform leadership faculty’s methods of teaching.

Others stand to benefit from the findings of this study, albeit indirectly. Discovering effective teaching methods for ethics and morals in leadership could help collegiate administrators, such as academic deans, to further analyze the true purpose of their course offerings and effective teaching methods for those courses. As a result, teaching refinements could be made to current courses. New courses could be developed with effective teaching methods for ethics and morals in leadership to use as a tool to ensure transferability of ethical and moral principles to students. Therefore, students, too, could benefit from the findings of this study, as they could become more competent and prepared for leading in ethical and moral ways as a result of enhanced teaching. Furthermore, employers who have been seeking students with sound ethical and moral leadership skills can reap the benefits from this study, as they could be provided with a more capable and ethically aware applicant-pool of qualified, prospective employees.

As noted, research in the area of ethics and morals in leadership is fragmented. This study will, in part, contribute to the existing body of knowledge on ethics and morals in leadership by asking faculty perceptions on how they think ethical leadership should be taught. Acquiring differing opinions from various academic fields could lead to
more sound research measuring the effects of teaching ethical and moral leadership in
the classroom and could lend much insight into already effective teaching practices,
especially nontraditional teaching practices. By obtaining more information about faculty
perceptions of their teaching methods, researchers and faculty alike could hope to
answer bigger questions, such as how they can improve their courses, curricula,
teaching methods, and retention and application of ethical and moral leadership
principles. Measuring faculty perceptions, as noted by Sims & Felton (2005) in their
conclusion, could lead to a sort of chain reaction for more ethically sound leaders:

If more professors seriously consider the question of how students learn
and the importance of teaching ethics, we will all help build an effective
environment for teaching and learning ethics, and the rewards—for us and
our students—will be exhilarating with fewer individuals committing ethical
missteps like those highlighted in the recent wave of corporate scandals (p. 46).

Though the findings of this study will neither solve society’s problem of unethical
acts nor rid it of immoral leaders. However, this study can contribute to address the
educational gap that exists about effective methods for teaching ethical and moral
leadership.

**Definition of Terms**

- College of agriculture: This term is defined as “a college of agriculture/college of
  agricultural and life sciences within a university established by the Land-grant Act
  of 1862” (vonStein, 2008). For the purposes of this study, college of agriculture
  will mean all universities represented by faculty participating in the study, not
  solely Land-grant Act universities.

- Effective teaching: "Let us begin, therefore, with a statement that is likely to
  receive a high degree of agreement, namely that effective teachers are those
  teachers whose students learn and grow the most. Therefore, to assess teaching
effectiveness, all we need to do is measure learning and growth across all of the
students in the class" (Tuckman, 1995, p. 127). In this study, effective teaching
will be measured by instructors’ own perceptions of how their teaching produces
learning and growth among undergraduates.
• Ethical Leadership: “ethical leadership is defined as ‘the demonstration of normatively appropriate conduct through personal actions and interpersonal relationships, and the promotion of such conduct to followers through two-way communication, reinforcement, and decision-making’” (Brown et al., 2005, p. 120).

• Ethics and morals: “The term ethics refers to judgments about whether human behavior is right or wrong. . . .ethics, which they [philosophers] define as the systematic study of the principles of right and wrong behavior, and morals, which they [philosophers] describe as specific standards of right and wrong” (Johnson, 2012, p. xxi). In this study, ethics and morals were operationally defined as meaning the identification of right and wrong principles, and the application of those principles according to moral standards (i.e. the application resulting in “good”, “bad”).

• Faculty: “the academic staff of a university such as senior teachers, lecturers, and/or researchers. The term also includes professors of various ranks, usually tenured or tenure-track in nature” (Blackburn & Lawrence, 1995). For the nature of this study, land-grant college of agriculture faculty who teach some component of ethics and morals in leadership were used as participants in the study.

• Teaching method: “the specific strategy or technique used to facilitate student learning” (Phipps, Osborne, Dyer, Ball, 2008, p.538).

• Undergraduate ethics course: Defined as an undergraduate credit-offering course with ethics or morals in the title and/or course description/s.

Limitations of the Study

This study includes some limitations that need to be acknowledged. One limitation was the specificity of the study: not all college of agriculture faculty teaching leadership could be identified, as a master list of such faculty did not exist. The study was limited to the data collected at the time of survey distribution; as a “snapshot” in time, the study did not capture trends. Additionally, the researcher did not examine course syllabuses to analyze ethics and morals in leadership curricula.

Basic Assumptions

Honest perceptions and responses from faculty participants were critical to the validity and soundness of this study. An assumption was that survey questions were
answered truthfully and kept confidential, so as to lend accurate information and avoid sharing of information with other participants, also known as subject effects. The researcher also assumed the contact e-mail addresses provided for the study by department chairs. The researcher also assumed that if a course had “ethics,” “morals,” or any variation of the two in the course title, the course instructor devoted time to teaching these topics. Lastly, the researcher assumed that participants will be able to accurately identify “effective” teaching methods; this assumed the instructors were able to critically analyze their teaching methods and pinpoint which of them were “effective,” as determined by the participants’ definition and experiences.

**Chapter Summary**

Over the past few decades, society has seen an increase in the number of high-profile scandals involving its leaders. As these ethical and moral trends have continued to happen in all sectors, they have suggested a lack of ethical and moral leadership education. These trends have created a two-part problem: increasing unethical and immoral leadership behavior from our society’s leaders, and a lack of knowledge and capability on how ethical and moral leadership knowledge and behaviors can be effectively taught and in turn, applied. In response to the mentioned decline leadership behaviors in society, many educational institutions are starting to encourage the teaching of ethical and moral leadership behaviors within their classrooms, including leadership departments within colleges of agriculture.

The purpose of this study was to measure faculty perceptions of methods for teaching ethical and moral leadership principles and behaviors in undergraduate college of agriculture courses. Chapter 1 described the significance of the study and how more effective methods of instruction for teaching ethical and moral leadership could be
identified from the findings of this study. In turn, more effective instruction could lead to better transferability of ethical and moral leadership knowledge to leadership behaviors, addressing society’s need for ethically and morally sound leaders. Chapter 1 also operationalized terms significant to this study and acknowledged limitations and basic assumptions of the study.
CHAPTER 2
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

Since the earliest establishment of educational institutions in America, “the central goal of the curriculum and even the entire college environment was to develop sensitivity to moral responsibilities, to teach ethical thought and action, and to develop students’ character” (McNeel. 1994, p. 27). Other scholars have noted this responsibility of academic institutions in current literature as well (Brown, Treviño, & Harrison, 2005, Swanson, 2004). The academic study of ethics and morals is not new. Scholars as old as Aristotle have long been questioning ethics and morals of society and individuals (Dean & Beggs, 2007). Ethical scandals and immoral behavior are perhaps just as old, but the recent ethical breaches plaguing all sectors of American society – from major corporations to small businesses – have gotten academic institutions’ attention and have caused administration and faculty members alike to revisit the moral education and leadership of their students (Dean & Beggs, 2006; Pennington, 2006).

Winston (2007) also noted the attention that moral education has been receiving: “while there is a documented need for ethics education, the business educators have indicated the need to understand how to incorporate ethical principles into coursework and degree programs” (p. 231). Many educators have used specific educational methods to help revise or create ethical and moral leadership curricula (Sims & Felton, 2005). This educational preparation was precisely what Winston (2007) suggested for preparing future leaders. “Thus, the need to prepare future graduates to be successful, ethical, and more conscious of their ability to make sound decisions highlights the importance of well-informed educational preparation” (p. 235). The following literature
clarified some of the present educational theories being used in ethical and moral education.

Overview

Chapter 1 illustrated the significance of unethical and immoral leadership in society and the lack of knowledge and competency surrounding how ethical and moral behaviors can be taught. An avenue that has been identified to help address society’s lack of ethical and moral leaders has been effective teaching and application of ethical and moral leadership in the classroom. This study provided more information on how ethical and moral leadership curricula is currently taught, specifically, educational frameworks and pedagogies faculty members have been using to teach ethical and moral leadership, and particular influences that affect individual cognitive moral development and behavior development.

Chapter 2 provided a literature review of some of the educational frameworks that have been used to develop ethical and moral leadership curricula. The educational frameworks discussed were combined into a theoretical foundation that was utilized in this study. A conceptual model that suggested a relationship between individual cognitive moral and behavior development and faculty members’ teaching methods helped illustrate the theoretical foundation presented. The purpose of this study was to determine faculty members’ perceptions of methods for teaching ethical and moral leadership principles and behaviors in undergraduate college of agriculture courses. The findings of this study will identify perceived effective teaching methods for ethical and moral leadership, and in turn, will help faculty members and other stakeholders to develop ethically and morally sound leaders – resulting in more ethical and moral leadership for society.
Definitions. After reviewing the literature, some inconsistencies were found in regards to the terms “ethics and morals.” Liddell and Cooper (2012) confirm the inconsistencies. “The term ‘moral development’ often is used as an interchangeable term for ‘ethical development,’ yet these are somewhat distinct constructs” (p. 14). As previously defined and for the purposes of this study, ethics and morals were operationally defined as: the identification of right and wrong principles, and the application of those principles according to moral standards. Ethical leadership was defined as: “the demonstration of normatively appropriate conduct through personal actions and interpersonal relationships, and the promotion of such conduct to followers through two-way communication, reinforcement, and decision-making” (Brown, et al., 2005, p. 120).

Theoretical Foundation

Theory of Cognitive Moral Development

According to Ambrose, Arnaud, and Schminke (2007), Beggs and Dean (2007), Ferris (1996), and Wright (1995), a theory that has had an impact on individual ethical and moral development is Lawrence Kohlberg’s theory of cognitive moral development. Sims and Felton (2005) stated, “Kohlberg (1981) was one of the first people to look seriously at whether a person’s ability to deal with ethical issues can develop later in life and whether education can affect that development” (p. 33). Many researchers have used Kohlberg’s theory to discern the differences in reasoning processes that people use to reach an ethical or moral decision (Brown & Treviño, 2006) and have concluded that ethics education can affect moral development (Sims & Felton, 2005). “Thus, cognitive moral development theory suggests that principled reasoning is based upon
one’s development of the capacity for higher level moral reasoning” (Brown & Treviño, 2006, p. 604).

The theory of cognitive moral development breaks down the process of “the progressive increase in moral autonomy in early adolescence” (Wright, 1995, p. 17). This theory consists of six stages, separated into three levels: pre-conventional level, conventional level, and post-conventional level. Each level indicates increased moral development from a prior level; the first level concerning personal gain or loss according to the outcomes of behavior, the second level concerning an individual’s thoughts in terms of the rules and laws that govern society, and the third level concerning justice and universal laws applicable to everyone (Hren, et al., 2006).

Within each level of morality are two stages. These stages are illustrative of the personal moral development stage an individual is currently at while progressing through the levels. Within preconventional morality, stage one is punishment orientation and stage two is reward orientation (Baxter & Rarick, 1987). Punishment orientation is directly reflected in the behavior of obeying rules to avoid punishment, while reward orientation is directly reflected in the behavior of conforming to obtain rewards and to have favors returned (Baxter & Rarick, 1987). The next level, conventional morality, houses two stages: good-boy/good-girl orientation, which is illustrated when individuals conform to avoid disapproval of others; and authority orientation, which is illustrated when individuals uphold “laws and social rules to avoid censure of authorities and feelings of guilt about not ‘doing one’s duty’” (Baxter & Rarick, 1987, p. 244). “According to Kohlberg, many individuals never progress beyond Level II” (Baxter & Rarick, 1987, p. 244). The last and highest level of individual moral development is postconventional
morality. The two stages present in this level are social contract orientation, where an individual’s behavior are “actions guided by principles commonly agreed on as essential to the public welfare; principles upheld to retain respect of peers and, this, self-respect”; and ethical principle orientation, where an individual’s behavior are “actions guided by self-chosen ethical principles (that usually value justice, dignity, and equality); principles upheld to avoid self-condemnation” (Baxter & Rarick, 1987, p. 244).

Important to Kohlberg’s theory and its place in this study’s theoretical foundation is its unique attention to individual moral growth development and processes. As Sims and Felton (2005) pointed out, stages of growth occur in many things, and moral development is not different. “Just as there are stages of growth in physical development, the ability to think morally also develops in stages (preconventional, conventional, and post conventional)” (p. 33).

Though many factors may influence personal moral growth and development, Kohlberg found that one of the most crucial factors is education (Sims & Felton, 2005). This attention to education is cause for Kohlberg’s theory of cognitive moral development to be included as a central theory and component in this study’s theoretical foundation, and as a result, its conceptual model. In their study focusing on a review of ethical leadership and its future direction, Brown and Treviño (2006) stated that Kohlberg’s theory of cognitive moral development suggested principled reasoning, or the rational decision-making, is “based upon one’s development of the capacity for higher level moral reasoning” (p. 604). However, as noted, Kohlberg’s theory’s efficacy and methodologies have yet to be identified (Beggs & Dean, 2007).
The Four Component Model

Another educational theory that added to this study’s theoretical foundation was James Rest and colleagues’ four-component model of moral reasoning. Wright (1995) stated that Rest has been widely recognized for his contributions to the “foundation theory of moral and ethical behaviour” (p. 18). As defined by Dean and Beggs (2006), Rest’s model consists of the following four components: moral sensitivity, which is further defined as “an awareness of the moral content in a situation”; moral judgment, which is an individual’s selection of an analytical framework or standard of judgment and further application of the selection to a situation to determine morally appropriate action; moral will (also known as moral motivation), which is the resolution to act in accordance with the judgment made; and lastly, moral action, which is the “implementation of the moral judgment” (p. 21). Liddell and Cooper described the relationship between moral will and moral action as: “It’s [moral will/motivation] the gut-check of moral action—the compass, the conscience, and the will to put aside personal interests in favor of moral values” (p. 12). As noted by Dean and Beggs (2006), “One of the assumptions of the four-component model is that moral behavior results from relationships among the four component process” (p. 21).

Some scholars state that Rest’s model is similar to Kohlberg’s theory of cognitive moral development (Brown & Treviño, 2006; Hren et al., 2006; Sims & Felton, 2005), however, some important distinctions should be recognized. As stated by Brown and Treviño (2006), Rest’s four component model, as compared to Kohlberg’s theory of cognitive moral development, is more schema-based than Kohlberg’s more rigid, hierarchical progression, which is based on philosophical theories of justice and rights. Dean and Beggs (2006) also emphasized key theoretical differences between the
models. Namely, Rest’s model focuses more on macro-morality implications, the formal structures of society, whereas those implications are not central to Kohlberg’s cognitive theory or moral development; and Rest’s model focuses more on moral behavior, as opposed to Kohlberg’s model, which focuses more on reasoning (Dean & Beggs, 2006). Hren et al. (2006) noted the distinction between the two models, highlighting that the difference lies in the process of development which can allow for more than one schema to occur at a time. “Rest and colleagues conceptualised it [moral reasoning] as an additive process occurring through two shifts in the proportional use of 3 moral reasoning schema from the lowest . . . to the highest” (Hren et al., 2006, p. 270).

Though much of the two models are based upon the same core principles of Kohlberg’s “broad cognitive and developmental theory” (Brown & Treviño, 2006, p. 605), the differences between the two, such as attention to moral reasoning versus moral behavior, are significant enough to merit inclusion into this study’s theoretical foundation.

Social Learning/Cognitive Theory

A third contributing theory that may influence ethical and moral leadership curricula, teaching practices, and help provide a medium for understanding ethical leadership is social learning theory. Gibson (2004) noted that social learning theory, recently renamed social cognitive theory, has provided “a broad explanation for the variables that influence adult learning” (p.194) and that:

SLT/SCT, although applicable to learning in all age groups, is shown to be especially relevant to adult learning, as it helps to explain the modeling function of observational learning; emphasizes the interaction of the person, behavior, and environment; and accounts for motivational aspects of learning (p.199).
Brown, et al. (2005) stated that social learning theory provides a “strong theoretical foundation for understanding ethical leadership” (129-130). Using social learning theory as a foundation to better understand ethical leadership will include leaders influencing the ethical conduct of followers through modeling, such as observational learning, identification, and imitation (Brown, et al., 2005).

Social learning theory, as developed by Bandura (1977, 1986), will contribute to this study’s theoretical foundation as it has provided a lens for understanding relationships, situations, and influences between followers and ethical leaders, and the interactions between the two. Brown and Treviño (2006) emphasized again the importance of modeling in this educational framework. “Social learning theory (Bandura 1977, 1986) is based on the idea that individuals learn by paying attention to and emulating the attitudes, values and behaviors of attractive and credible role models” (Brown & Treviño, 2006, p. 597). This modeling behavior was also supported by Lee and Cheng (2012) who noted that learning occurs from direct experience, but also from observing others’ actions and consequences.

As shown, social learning theory has been an educational framework heavily dependent upon psychological matching processes such as imitation (Brown, et al., 2005) and role modeling (Brown & Treviño, 2006; Lee & Cheng, 2012). Since followers often learn from leaders, social learning theory posits that ethical behaviors and practices could also be learned from psychological matching processes such as observation, substitution of behaviors, and mimicking. In a later study, Brown and Treviño (2006) specifically identified social learning theory and its components, including role modeling, as an approach for educational institutions to develop and train
future leaders. However, Brown and Treviño (2006) also noted that there has not been much research conducted on the transferability of social learning theory directly to course design:

Thus far, little research has focused on how to design (e.g. frequency, duration, specific content, pedagogy) an ethical leadership development program based upon role modeling; or, on whether such an intervention approach might also be used for ethical leadership in instruction in educational institutions. (p. 609)

Nevertheless, Brown and Treviño (2006) concluded that role-modeling and vicarious learning might be essential to the learning process of ethical and moral leadership. “Vicarious learning should be particularly important for learning about ethical and unethical behavior in organizational contexts” (Brown & Treviño, 2006, p. 598).

**Conceptual Model**

The theoretical foundation for this study consisted of three theories: theory of cognitive moral development, the four component theory, and social learning theory. In particular, the theory of cognitive moral development and the four component theory contributed much to the theoretical foundation and conceptual model of this study. Social learning theory helped to support the researcher-developed conceptual model. These theories have been depicted in the adapted conceptual model represented in Figure 1 at the end of Chapter 2.

As the model has shown, each of the presented foundational theories has been perceived to influence the development of ethical and moral development, and therefore, leadership, in some way. Bandura’s social learning theory was represented in the model as the external influences, including family, community, non-formal learning experiences (i.e. Girl Scouts of America, etc.), and workplace environment. These
influences directly impact an individual’s values and beliefs, which are consistent with Bandura’s social learning theory (Bandura, Social cognitive theory, 2001).

For this conceptual model, the researcher defined values as the following: “A value system is an enduring organization of beliefs concerning preferable modes of conduct or end states of existence along a continuum of relative importance” (Rokeach, 1973, no page). Posner (2010) summed up values. “Values are the core of who people are. They influence the choices they make, the people they trust, the appeals they respond to, and the way people invest their time and energy” (Posner, 2010, p. 457). For this study, belief was incorporated into the conceptual model based on Ashkanasy, Windsor, and Treviño’s 2006 study, concluding that, “the interactive influence of cognitive moral development and belief in a just world on ethical decision-making suggests that ethical decision-making involves a complex interaction of cognitive styles and deeply rooted belief systems” (p. 469).

Also directly affecting an individual’s values and beliefs are the components of the formal education process. As depicted in the model, ethical and moral leadership curriculum directly influence effective teaching methods (the highlight of this study), which, in turn, directly affects teacher behavior. Kohlberg’s cognitive theory of moral development and Rest’s four component model are depicted on the right-hand side of the conceptual model. Kohlberg’s theory is depicted by the three levels and stages of individual cognitive moral development (Level I, II, and III, and Stages 1-6). Within those levels resides Rest’s four-component model of behavior development. These four components: moral sensitivity (MS), moral judgment (MJ), moral will (MW), and moral action (MA), represent the process an individual takes to reach a certain moral
behavior. As the model shows, the process an individual takes to reach a moral action
or behavior (Rest’s theory) directly influences the level of cognitive moral development
they are at (Kohlberg’s theory), all of which are directly influenced by an individual’s
values and beliefs. It is noted in the model that an individual must progress through all
of the four-components of moral reasoning (MS, MJ, MW, and MA) and achieve both
stages of development in a level before that individual may progress. An individual’s
cognitive moral development and behavior development also influence the formal
education process. As a student progresses through the levels, a faculty member’s
ethical and moral leadership curriculum, effective teaching methods, and behavior could
change to suit the increased moral reasoning/learning style, consequently affecting the
students’ values and beliefs. In this way, the conceptual model has a cyclical
component. This model is meant to represent the myriad of teaching practices available
to faculty members to cater to students’ learning styles, including traditional (i.e. lecture)
and non-traditional (i.e. guest speakers, internships, role-modeling, etc.) teaching
practices.

As depicted in the conceptual model, the avenues through which the
development of moral standards and ethical behavior in college students are affected
are quite extensive. These influences are expected to have a direct relationship to the
outcome of student behavior. For the purpose of this study, the researcher focused
solely on the relationship between formal education and an individual’s cognitive moral
development and behavior development; namely, faculty perceptions of methods for
teaching ethical and moral leadership principles and behaviors.
Literature Review

As evident in the literature that follows, much of the theoretical foundation and conceptual model was based upon empirical findings. The conceptual model illustrated different influences that ultimately impact an individual’s cognitive moral development and behavior development according to Kohlberg, Rest, and Bandura’s models. The material presented hereafter has provided more information on those influences and their connections to an individual’s cognitive moral development and behavior development.

Factors Influencing the Development of Ethical and Moral Standards and Behaviors

One influence that was presented in the conceptual model was workplace environment. Workplace environment was presented as an external influence that affects an individual’s cognitive moral development and behavior development. One study that examined this relationship was conducted by Ambrose et al. (2007). Ambrose et al. (2007) noted that while most research on cognitive moral development in organizations focused on the relationship between cognitive moral development and behavior, “little is known about how the ethical climate of the organization [workplace environment in this study’s conceptual model] may interact with the cognitive moral development of its employees to affect their attitudes and behaviors” (p. 325).

In their study, Ambrose et al. (2007) examined levels of moral development to organizational ethical climates. Though based on Kohlberg’s cognitive theory of moral development, the researchers used Rest’s Defining Issues Test (DIT) to assess individual moral development. Rest’s DIT uses Kohlberg’s theory and ethical vignettes to assess an individual’s current level of moral development (Ambrose et al. 2007).
Among their findings, they noted that a relationship exists between an organization’s ethical climate (a component of workplace environment) and an individual’s level of cognitive moral development (Ambrose et al. 2007). Their findings suggested that an individual’s fit with an organization’s ethical climate is a strong predictor of organizational outcomes, or that individual’s attitudes and behaviors.

Workplace environment was presented as only a small component of what may influence an individual’s values and beliefs, in turn influencing their cognitive moral development and behavior development. Other external influences have also been shown to influence cognitive moral development and behavior, like those reported in the O’Fallon and Butterfield 2005 study. O’Fallon and Butterfield (2005) conducted a thorough review of empirical ethical-decision making literature from 1996 to 2003. In their review, they reported findings from studies they had analyzed by dependent variable, such as, awareness, judgment, behavior, etc. These findings by dependent variable were consistent with this study’s theoretical foundation and conceptual model, specifically Rest’s four component model, as seen by the direct relationship in the dependent variables previously mentioned (awareness, judgment, behavior).

In support of this study’s theoretical framework and specific components of the conceptual model, O’Fallon and Butterfield (2005) reported the following findings relevant to this study: Yetmar and Eastman (2000) found that “Job satisfaction is positively associated with ethical sensitivity” (O’Fallon & Butterfield, p. 378, Table II). Their finding reflects a positive relationship to this study’s theoretical framework and conceptual model, namely that a component of workplace environment, job satisfaction, directly affects the moral sensitivity or a person. Organizational ethical climate was
previously mentioned (Ambrose et al. 2007); organizational factors, such as ethical climate, external environment, and industry type, were also mentioned in the O’Fallon and Butterfield (2005) study. Among their review, they reported findings from Singhapakdi, Karande, Rao, and Vitell (2001), which included that “Ethical climate strongly influences perceived importance of ethics” (O’Fallon & Butterfield, 2005, p. 386, Table III), and findings from Christie, Kwon, Stoeberl, and Baumhart (2003), which included that “The external environment had a positive influence on attitudes toward questionable business practices” (O’Fallon & Butterfield, 2005, p. 386, Table III).

Important to this study and a central focus of the conceptual model, O’Fallon and Butterfield (2005) reported the findings of three studies which supported positive influence of ethics education: Kracher, Chatterjee, and Lundquist (2002) found that “Education was positively associated with moral development scores” (O’Fallon & Butterfield, 2005, p. 381, Table III); Razzaque and Hwee (2002) found that “Education was a significant and positive influence on judgment in 4 of 6 scenarios” (O’Fallon & Butterfield, 2005, p. 381, Table III); and Wu (2003) found that “In 1 of 5 scenarios, there was a significant difference in ethical recognition after receiving a Business ethics education” (O’Fallon & Butterfield, 2005, p. 381, Table III). Each of the three findings supported this study’s theoretical framework and conceptual model which suggested a relationship between education and moral development.

Related to the dependent variable of judgment, O’Fallon and Butterfield (2005) reported Wimalasiri, Pavri, and Jalil’s (1996) findings: “A significant relationship between higher stages of moral reasoning and higher degree of religious commitment existed” (p. 385, Table III). This finding was consistent with the external influence of
religion affecting individual cognitive moral development (Kohlberg’s theory), as depicted in this study’s conceptual model. Also related to religion and this study’s conceptual model, but with a dependent variable of awareness, was Singhapakdi, Marta, Rallapalli, and Rao’s 2000 study, reported by O’Fallon and Butterfield (2005), which found that “In 3 of 4 scenarios, there was a positive relationship between religion and perception of an ethical problem” (p. 378, Table II).

Though religion was a component of this study’s conceptual model, behavior and behavior development were overarching outcomes of the conceptual model. Among O’Fallon and Butterfield’s (2005) review, they included four studies pertinent to Kohlberg’s theory and Rest’s theory, major components of this study’s theoretical framework and conceptual model. As reported by O’Fallon and Butterfield (2005), Green and Weber (1997) found that “Higher levels of moral reasoning lead to more ethical behavior” (p. 393, Table V). A second study reported by O’Fallon and Butterfield (2005), was Honeycutt, Glassman, Zugelder, and Karande’s (2001) study which found that “Ethical judgment was positively related to ethical behavior” (p. 393, Table V). The last two studies, conducted by Greenberg (2002), and Abdolmohammadi and Sultan (2002), found that “Individuals classified as conventional [Kohlberg’s Level II] rather than preconventional [Kohlberg’s Level I] stole significantly less money,” and “Individuals with a lower P-score were more likely to engage in unethical behavior” (O’Fallon & Butterfield, 2005, p. 393, Table V), respectively.

In O’Fallon and Butterfield’s (2005) conclusion, they stated that their review of the empirical literature indicated that “more education, employment or work experience is positively related to ethical decision-making (12 out of 18 studies)” (p. 387). They also
noted that peer influence, an external influence in this study’s conceptual model, showed promise as a contextual moderating variable and that other studies have found a “positive direct effect for peer influence on the ethical decision-making process” (O’Fallon & Butterfield, 2005, p. 401). Both statements supported this study’s theoretical framework and conceptual model. It is important to note that O’Fallon and Butterfield (2012) also reported findings from studies that looked at other variables such as significant others, nationality, and age. Though important for a review of the literature, these variables were not mentioned above as they have not been explicitly included in this study’s theoretical framework and conceptual model.

Other variables that were important to this study’s theoretical framework and conceptual model included family, community, peers, and media. In a 2005 article, authors Hart and Carlo discussed some of these variables as impacting moral development in adolescence. Though no specific experimental findings were presented, the authors noted that several variables and cultures impact an individual’s moral development including peers, parents and family, work environment, social institutions, media, and non-formal learning experiences, such as volunteering and extracurricular activities (Hart & Carlo, 2005). As this study’s theoretical framework and conceptual model has shown, multiple influences, like those previously mentioned, can affect an individual’s moral development. Hart and Carlo (2005) refer to these multiple influences as having moral dimensions of their own that constituents have to (to some extent) subscribe to. “These multiple moral cultures may comprise their family demands, their peer demands, and the demands placed on them by the broader society (e.g. school systems” (Hart & Carlo, 2005, p. 231). As Hart and Carlo mentioned, those different
influences each have different cultural norms and beliefs that impact adolescents’ moral functioning (2005).

**Literature Supporting Formal Education as an Influencing Factor**

As noted by several scholars, the formal education process has also affected individual’s moral functioning processes (Cloninger & Selvarajan, 2010; Jagger, 2011; King & Mayhew, 2002; Maeda et al., 2009; Sims & Felton, 2005). In a study analyzing two components of Rest’s model, moral sensitivity and moral judgment, Jagger (2011) used the previously mentioned DIT test to determine changes in moral judgment “resulting from an educational intervention” (p. 13). Jagger (2011) believes that educational efforts should focus on specific components of Rest’s model, specifically moral sensitivity and moral judgment. The study found that “low levels of ethical sensitivity can have a significant impact on the ability of a person to develop moral judgment” (Jagger, 2011, p. 23). Jagger highlighted this finding, making a connection to both Rest’s and Kohlberg’s models, and therefore strengthening this study’s theoretical framework and conceptual model. “In other words, students who struggled to identify and interpret the ethical issues to a reasonably high level were less able to make postconventional moral judgements” (Jagger, 2011, p. 23). Jagger (2011) noted different methods for teaching ethical and moral behavior, but strongly suggested that in accordance with the study’s findings, skills-based approaches (i.e. critical analysis, logic-based exercises, case studies, debates, discussions), rather than rules-based approaches (i.e. legality and codes of conduct) would be more effective. “This study suggests that skills-based approaches, which motivate and engage to develop ethical sensitivity, would be a more effective initial focus” (Jagger, 2011, p. 24). As Jagger’s study showed and as was evident in this study’s conceptual model, formal education
has had an impact on individual cognitive moral development and behavior development.

An additional study that linked formal education to individual moral development in adolescents and youth was Maeda, Thoma, and Bebeau’s 2009 study. Their study, which also used Rest’s DIT Test to judge variation in moral judgment level, noted that “late adolescence through early youth is associated with the transition from a conventional to postconventional view of morality” (Maeda et al., 2009). Maeda et al. (2009) recognized other studies that believe “students are influenced by the curriculum, both formal (e.g., coursework highlighting moral issues) and informal (the social environment that fosters a discussion of moral issues. . .)” (p. 233). Maeda et al. (2009) also stated that according to research, an individual’s moral judgment development is associated with educational environments. These statements and the findings that follow have strengthened this study’s theoretical framework and conceptual model. Using Rest’s DIT-2 (a version of the original DIT Test) to measure a component of Kohlberg’s theory of cognitive moral development, Maeda, et al. (2009) found “there is a significant variation in the average DIT-2 scores across groups obtained from different higher education institutions” (p. 243). This particular finding was also consistent with King and Mayhew’s (2002) discussion that differing higher education institutions produce variation in individual’s moral judgment development as measured by the DIT-2. Maeda et al. (2009) concluded that “the findings empirically demonstrate that the educational context should be taken into account to understand variation in the individual level of moral judgment” (p. 245). This study has done just that by including formal education as a large component of the conceptual model.
An additional finding by King and Mayhew (2002) of particular importance to this study was their finding that “specific collegiate contexts (liberal arts colleges, certain types of educational experiences) are also associated with growth in moral judgment, and with the production of moral behavior” (p. 266). This was a notable finding, as this study measured faculty perceptions of methods for teaching ethical and moral leadership in a specific context: colleges of agriculture.

A study that differed from the ones previously mentioned, but which still contributed to this thesis’ theoretical framework and conceptual model was research conducted by Cloninger and Selvarajan (2010). As opposed to an overall general view of ethics education or ethical and moral leadership education, Cloninger and Selvarajan’s study focused solely on examining whether or not a single course in ethical decision-making could reduce “organizational influences and improve ethical judgment and performance” (2010, p. 4). The study used a sample of 175 individuals with an average work experience of about nine years who were all pursuing master’s degrees primarily in business (Cloninger & Selvarajan, 2010). After completing a course in business and society with a focus on ethics, the individuals were asked to rate an ethical vignette (Cloninger & Selvarajan, 2010). Cloninger and Selvarajan (2010) found that students who had completed the course “demonstrated better ethical judgment than students who had not completed the course” (p. 9). Their findings indicated that education, even a single course in ethics, could improve individuals’ capacity for ethical reasoning (Cloninger & Selvarajan). Along with the other findings presented in this section, Cloninger and Selvarajan’s study recognizes the relationship between
individual cognitive moral development and behavior development and formal education.

A study similar to Cloninger and Selvarajan’s 2010 study was Northern Illinois University College of Business’ (NIUCB) Building Ethical Leaders using an Integrated Ethical Framework (BELIEF) program; both studies looked at a more narrow view of ethical and moral leadership and behaviors in the context of a classroom. As noted by Winston (2007), “There are challenges associated with the design and delivery of curricula and course content that reflect the importance of ethical leadership and ethical decision making” (p. 235). NIUCB developed BELIEF to address those “challenges” by supporting two learning objectives: “(1) increase students’ awareness of ethical issues and (2) strengthen their decision-making abilities regarding these ethical issues” (Dzuranin, Shortridge, and Smith, 2012, In press). The first objective of the program, increase students’ awareness of ethical issues, is related to this study’s theoretical framework in that Rest’s first component in his four component model calls for moral sensitivity. After measuring improvement from before implementation of BELIEF (2005) to after implementation (2011), the researchers Dzuranin et al. (2012) found that the BELIEF program has had a positive impact and has met its two learning objectives: “Student recognition and decision-making skills regarding ethical dilemmas improved after the implementation of the Program”. “Internally, assessment results indicate that post-implementation of the Program about 90% of NIU COB students meet or exceed expectations for ethical awareness and decision-making” (Dzuranin et al., 2012). The BELIEF program has been nationally recognized as a best practice for ethics education.
by the AACSB, who first called for like programs to address the shortage of ethical leaders in society (Alsop, 2003).

**Current Teaching Practices for Ethical and Moral Leadership**

Many scholars have written about the beneficial effects of college education on moral and ethical judgments (Dean & Beggs, 2006). The teaching of ethics in institutions of higher education has been debated (Peppas & Diskin, 2001; Sims & Felton, 2005), however, a study by Sims and Felton (2005) reported that “the moral development of students can be enhanced through the education process” (p. 32). In regards to the debate, Ryan and Bisson (2011) stated, “it is not that ethics cannot be taught, but rather, how ethics education is delivered which might be the reason for poor ethical attitude amongst students and recent graduates” (p. 47). Though no one set of teaching practices has been identified as effective for teaching ethical and moral leadership, numerous studies have been conducted (Dean & Beggs, 2006; Ferris, 1996; Sims & Felton, 2005, Sims & Sims, 1991; Winston, 2005; Wright, 1995) that have provided evidence of the specific teaching practices used in classrooms. The following are teaching practices that have been mentioned in the literature as current educational practices used for teaching ethics and morals in a leadership-related context or setting.

One current teaching practice is the development of personal managerial codes, or codes of ethics, as suggested by Ferris, 1996; Sims & Felton, 2005; and Conroy & Emerson (as cited by Dean and Beggs, 2006). Ferris stated that these codes focus “directly on the moral implications of likely behaviors within the particular corporate setting involved” (1996, p. 344). In his study, Ferris (1996) tested groups of students who had previously completed an ethics course and produced a personal code of
ethics. Overall, his study’s findings reflected a highly beneficial effect for students who had taken a course in ethics.

Though Ferris (1996) argued that personal ethical codes are central to building a “well-developed moral sense that goes beyond a gut-level response” (p. 346), he stated that numerous teaching elements would be required to develop such a moral sense. Another of these teaching elements is role-modeling, as reported by Wright (1995) and Sims (2001). “Role-playing also provides students with the opportunity to participate with a high level of personal involvement” (Sims, 2001, p. 399). As previously mentioned, role-modeling is a component of social learning theory (Brown & Treviño, 2006).

Through interview analysis, Sims and Felton (2005) found several practices that current ethics instructors (though no relationship to leadership was identified) perceived as effective in their teaching experience. These teaching practices included storytelling, dialogue, and specific practices, such as defining ethics. An interesting conclusion by Sims and Felton (2005) was that ethics education should be treated as a holistic process, one where the responsibility for learning should be shared amongst the teachers and students.

In another study involving ethics instructors, Dean and Beggs (2006) reported the following responses as teaching practices used by the survey participants: sharing newspaper articles, stories, and real-world situations; sharing theoretical frameworks and stakeholder analysis models; and lastly, using critical reflection exercises and case study analyses to recommend courses of action and justification for proposed actions. Sims (1991) reinforced the use of case studies in his report stating that they provide
another teaching vehicle for analyzing ethical problems and crafting resolutions. Other scholars such as Begley and Stefkovich (2007) have also noted the use of case studies as a resource and teaching strategy. Similar to Dean and Beggs’ study (2006), Ryan and Bisson (2011) also found a myriad of teaching practices to be in use, including videotapes, recommended readings, lectures, essays, group discussions, and exams. Other teaching practices mentioned in the literature have included discussions (Sims, 1991), journaling, and simulations. “In simulations designed for teaching business ethics, students can be faced with ethical dilemmas that encourage them to react and act on the problems as though they were in a real-life situation” (Sims, 1991, p. 399).

These studies reflect a wide variety of ethical and moral instructional methods in use. Relevant to teaching practices, Keller (2007) noted the difference between straight lecture and transformational instructional methodologies. Keller (2007) stated that direct presentations of class concepts and information (i.e., lecture) was an example of transactional instructional methodologies, whereas critical reflection and discussion were deemed as transformational instructional methodologies. In his findings, Keller (2007) noted that his sample of students’ preferred discussion over straight lecture.

Much of the context of the presented literature has not been directly related to leadership or leadership educators, which presents a notable gap in the research covering ethical and moral leadership. Though some of the literature has tied in to ethical leadership and managerial leadership, much of it has been based on business ethics courses. While not theoretical in nature, leadership content taught in business
schools was still applicable to the nature of this study. However, a lack of literature tied to specific pedagogical practices for ethical and moral leadership should be noted.

Summary

In summary, there are two overarching theories, Kohlberg’s cognitive theory of moral development and Rest’s four-component model; and one contributing theory, Bandura’s social learning theory, that have been linked to the development of moral standards and ethical behaviors. These theories, along with the evidence that supports their inclusion into this study’s theoretical framework and conceptual model, provided a strong foundation from which this study was formed. This study helped to identify relationships between the theories presented and the impact of formal education on individual cognitive moral development and behavior development, namely through the avenue of faculty perceptions of teaching methods for ethical and moral leadership. Chapter 2 provided recent literature addressing the components of the conceptual model and influences to individual development.

As Begley and Stefkovich (2007) noted, understanding student development and the use of educational theories to help student development may be critical in determining how to best design ethical and moral leadership curricula. “Being conscientious of developmental stages is as relevant to the sensitive design of curriculum for students as is it to the analysis of motivations and valuation process” (p. 405). Sims and Felton (2005) also noted that the use of educational theories as frameworks for developing curricula should be a top priority for faculty members:

Equally important, we want to build a framework upon which ethics can be taught, and we cannot leave it to the specialists alone, good as they may be. We the teachers, are those responsible for teaching ethics, need to articulate what we do. If more professors seriously consider the question of how students learn and the importance of teaching ethics, and the
rewards—for us and our students—will be exhilarating with fewer individuals committing ethical missteps like those highlighted in the recent wave of corporate scandals. (p. 46).

The lack of research on pedagogical practices in ethical and moral leadership is evident. However, this study’s findings, which measured faculty members’ perceptions of methods for teaching ethical and moral leadership, will help contribute to the knowledge base and provide a starting point for more research in this area.
Figure 2-1. Development of Moral Standards and Ethical Behaviors in College Students
CHAPTER 3
METHODOLOGY

Chapter 3 discusses the methodology of the study focusing on faculty perceptions of methods for teaching ethical and moral leadership principles and behaviors in undergraduate college of agriculture courses. In Chapter 3, the researcher will discuss the research perspective and specific methods used to measure faculty perceptions and the objectives outlined in Chapter 1. The researcher will also discuss the instrument utilized and address validity and reliability issues related to the study. Finally, the researcher will discuss the data sources used and explain how data were analyzed and summarized.

Research Perspective

This study was exploratory in nature, questioning faculty perceptions of methods for teaching ethical and moral leadership principles and behaviors. In essence, this study sought to quantitatively describe a phenomenon in order to learn more about it and provide sound findings for more experimental research to be conducted on the same phenomena in the future. From a researcher perspective, a quantitative approach seemed most appropriate for this study, as the researcher would be describing a phenomenon deductively and be removed from personal interaction with the participants of the study. As outlined in Ary, Jacobs, and Sorenson (2010) these are determining characteristics for quantitative approaches to research.

Research Design

This study was conducted in a descriptive manner. According to Ary et al. (2010), descriptive research “asks questions about the nature, incidence, or distribution of variables; it involves describing, but not manipulating variables” (p. 640). For this study,
the dependent variable were faculty members’ perceptions, and antecedent variables was faculty members’ demographical characteristics.

Further, a descriptive survey was used to measure faculty perceptions of methods for teaching ethical and moral leadership principles and behaviors. The survey was constructed according to Dillman, Smyth, and Christian (2009) and was distributed in an electronically-formatted questionnaire to study participants. The questionnaires were distributed via electronic mail to participants’ electronic mailboxes. The researcher decided upon the use of electronic mail survey questionnaires for several reasons, as described by Ary et al. (2010): the reduced time required for assembly and mailing, no postage costs, ease for researcher, low social desirability bias, and anonymity for participants (increasing participant safety). The researcher also considered advantageous reasons for electronic mail questionnaires. As stated by Dillman et al. (2009), electronic mail questionnaires have distinct advantages over regular mail, encouraged prompter returns, lower non-response rates, and allowed for more complete answers to open-ended questionnaire items. A disadvantage that Ary et al. (2010) pointed out was that electronic mail surveys have only been appropriate for use when the researcher has valid electronic mail addresses for all members of a finite population. Since this study involved faculty members at land-grant colleges, and valid electronic mail addresses were required of each faculty member, this disadvantage was addressed.

A potential validity threat for research studies, external validity, is defined as “the extent to which the findings of a particular study can be generalized to other subjects, other settings, and/or other operational definitions of the variables” (Ary et al. 2010).
Because of the census nature of the study, no generalizations were appropriate. Thus, external validity was not a concern.

As identified by Dillman et al. (2009), four main types of errors that descriptive survey research studies should seek to address are: coverage error, sampling error, non-response error, and measurement error. Coverage error was defined as, “when not all members of the population have a known, nonzero chance of being included in the sample for the survey and when those who are excluded are different from those who are included on measures of interest” (Dillman et al. 2009, p. 17). Since this study was a census study and utilized an entire population, coverage error did not present a major issue, but the researcher did made every attempt to include all members of the population, however, some members of the population were not able to be determined based on lack of contact information. Dillman et al. defined sampling error as the “extent to which the precision of the survey estimates is limited because not every person in the population is sampled” (2009). Sampling error was not an issue in this study because all eligible survey participants were encouraged and provided the chance to response to the survey. A third source of error, non-response, comes from not receiving responses from all participants that were included in the sample (Dillman et al. 2009). For this study, non-response was addressed using procedures recommended in the Tailored Design Method (Dillman et al. 2009). The researcher also interviewed a sample percentage of the non-respondents to determine if a calculable difference or possible bias between the original population and the non-respondents was present. Finally, measurement error, described as resulting “from inaccurate answers to questions and stems from poor questions wording, survey mode effects, or aspects of the
respondent’s behavior” (Dillman et al. 2009, p. 19), was minimized by the use of a pilot test prior to final survey distribution.

**Data Sources**

This study was constructed to serve as a census study, which, Ary et al. defined as “a survey that includes the entire population of interest” (2009, p. 637). The context of the study was within land-grant colleges of agriculture. The data sources utilized for this study were all leadership education faculty in departments of agricultural education within colleges of agriculture that have taught some component of ethical and moral leadership in their undergraduate leadership education courses.

As a current list of the described population did not exist, a researcher-developed list of all eligible participants for this study was constructed. The list was partially developed by land-grant universities listed on the Association of Leadership Educators (ALE, 2012) website, the Association of Public and Land-Grant Universities (APLU, 2012) official website, and the American Association for Agricultural Education’s (AAAE, 2012) website. This list, comprised of 77 separate colleges or schools of agriculture, provided the study with an overall population of 32 individuals. As a census, the entire population was asked to participate in the study.

**Instrumentation and Data Collection**

The survey questionnaire was developed in Qualtrics, an online survey software. Because a current instrument that measured faculty perceptions of teaching methods for ethical and moral leadership did not exist at the time of the study, the instrument was researcher-developed. Great care was taken in the overall look and appeal of the survey design, as these elements are critical to high response rates (Dillman et al. 2009). Official University of Florida logos were represented on all materials associated
with the study to legitimize the source, provide a sense of professionalism to study
customers, and maintain accordance with the University of Florida Institutional Review
Board. In accordance with the Tailored Design Method (Dillman et al. 2009), the survey
was developed for a sixth-grade reading level and was comprised of only questions that
represented the conceptual domains. A panel of experts, composed of leadership
faculty similar to the study’s participants, was used to help develop and review the
survey questions and provide a validity check of the instrument.

The researcher submitted a proposal of the instrument to the University of Florida
Institutional Review Board (IRB-02) for approval before any data collection occurred.
After gaining approval from the IRB-02, the researcher conducted a pilot test, consisting
of eleven individuals, to help determine the reliability and validity of the instrument. This
pilot test was conducted three weeks prior to questionnaire distribution to allow ample
time for revisions. After completion of the pilot test and instrument changes, the survey
questionnaire was then distributed to all valid participant e-mail addresses that were
obtained. Data were collected on years of teaching experience, age, gender, race, and
educational level achieved. As suggested by Dillman et al. (2009) demographic
questions were presented to participants at the end of the survey. The final version of
the survey instrument can be found in Appendix B.

An e-mail about faculties’ initial inclusion into the study was sent to participants to
notify them of the upcoming survey, provide study information, including its purpose,
encourage their participation by assuring them that the results of the study would be
provided and show appreciation for their assistance with the study. The promise of
providing results was the only incentive used in this study. Each e-mail included the
participants’ name, and assured participants that their responses to the survey questionnaire would be confidential. The study’s survey instrument was researcher-developed and included a mixture of close-ended questions and open-ended questions. At least four questions were formulated in order to measure each of the four objectives listed in Chapter 1. Reminder e-mails were sent out according to the Tailored Design method (Dillman et al. 2009) at varying times past the initial survey distribution. These attempts at addressing non-response were all personalized. The e-mails were sent to initial non-respondents over a period of two weeks. Follow-up telephone calls were made as an attempt to reach non-respondents, answer any questions they may have had and to encourage them to complete the survey.

Several types of validity threats exist with survey questionnaires. As explained by Ary et al. (2010), construct validity is the extent to which a construct actually measures what it was designed to measure. To address this threat, the study utilized a panel of experts to judge whether the survey represented questions concerning the study’s objectives. Criterion-related validity is based upon the relationship between the participants and other variables (Ary et al. 2010). Included in criterion-related validity threats are five problems that could influence the overall validity of a questionnaire: respondents reporting false information, respondents reporting false information that is more socially acceptable than true information, respondents reporting what they think the researcher wants to hear, respondents giving thoughtless responses to get the study over with, and respondents giving safe answers because they are unsure of their anonymity (Ary et al. 2010). Because of the nature of the study, the researcher was only able to address the last problem (anonymity) by assuring the participants by cover letter
and e-mail correspondence that their responses would be completely anonymous. As personal interviews were not a part of this study, other criterion-related validity threats were unable to be addressed and remained as limitations of this study.

**Data Analysis**

The survey was distributed electronically, and all numerical data were processed through data-processing software, Statistical Packages for the Social Sciences (SPSS)®, version 20.0. for Windows™. To summarize and organize data and to help describe important observations, descriptive statistics (frequencies) were calculated on all study variables. The open-ended questions on the instrument were analyzed through content analysis, using comparative coding, which helped in identifying similar themes among responses. Demographic information was obtained to determine if any significant relationships existed between leadership educators’ characteristics and their perceptions of teaching methods for ethical and moral leadership.

**Summary**

Chapter 3 described the descriptive survey process used to determine leadership education faculty perceptions of methods for teaching ethical and moral leadership in undergraduate courses. The population of college of agriculture leadership education faculty who had taught some component of ethical and moral leadership within an undergraduate course was defined and described. The researcher-developed instrument was presented and explained, and threats to reliability and credibility were discussed and addressed. This study modeled and explained research methods prescribed in the Tailored Design Method (Dillman et al. 2009) in the survey instrumentation creation and distribution process. Finally, the researcher explained the data analysis techniques to assess survey data.
CHAPTER 4
RESULTS

The previous chapters have defined and described the problem of unethical and immoral leaders in today’s society. Chapter 1 presented the problem of unethical and immoral leaders and a brief history of ethical and moral leadership instruction within colleges of agriculture. Because of the increasing demand for educational institutions to produce ethically and morally sound leaders, scholars have begun to evaluate how well business schools and leadership programs are implementing ethical guidelines as suggested by the Association of American Colleges and Universities (Dey & Associates, 2010). Though researched previously among business schools, the research suggested many scholars have overlooked other academic fields where leaders are being produced, namely colleges of agriculture. Chapter 1 presented the problem along with the purpose, objectives and definitions for this study. By researching faculty perceptions of methods for teaching ethical and moral leadership principles and behaviors in undergraduate college of agriculture courses, the results will enable educators, practitioners, employers, administrators, and the like to positively affect the next crop of leaders for our society to lead in an ethical and moral manner.

Chapter 2 presented and discussed previous research in this area, presented the theoretical framework for this study and provided a visual representation of the framework in the conceptual model. Major theories that contributed to the theoretical foundation of this study were Kohlberg’s Cognitive Theory of Moral Development, Rest’s Four Component Model and Social Learning/Cognitive Theory. These theories were discussed and depicted in the conceptual model. Chapter 2 also provided literature on the following sub-sections: factors influencing the development of ethical and moral
standards and behaviors, literature supporting formal education as an influencing factor, and current teaching practices for ethical and moral leadership.

Chapter 3 discussed the methodology used for the study including specific methods used to measure faculty perceptions. The quantitative research design was described and data sources, instrumentation and methods for data analysis were presented and described.

Chapter 4 will focus specifically on the results of this study, categorized by research objectives. The population for this study consisted of 32 individuals who taught some component of ethical and moral leadership within undergraduate courses in colleges of agriculture. The study was conducted following the procedures outlined in Chapter 3. The initial response rate consisted of 25 participants. After determining that only 18 participants were qualified, a response rate of 56% \((n = 18)\) resulting in 18 number of cases \((n)\) was obtained. Based upon the recommended response rate of 28.6% for a finite population (Israel, 2009), this study’s response rate of 56% was deemed acceptable.

**Objective 1: To Identify Effective Methods for Developing Student Knowledge of Ethical and Moral Leadership Principles as Reported by College of Agriculture Faculty.**

The questionnaire contained four items that specifically addressed effective methods for developing student knowledge of ethical and moral leadership principles. Participants were asked to select specific instructional techniques they used when teaching ethical and/or moral leadership principles. All 18 participants responded. The responses follow and are also recorded in Table 4-1: traditional lecture, exams, quizzes, instructor-led discussion, student-led discussion, discussion groups, activities, videos, social media (e.g. Facebook, Twitter), guest lecturers, current event/s activities,
journals, role playing/role-modeling, popular press (e.g. newspaper articles, magazine articles, etc.), simulations, case studies, and other.

As the table shows, two participants selected the “other” category. These two participants listed “debates” and “student attendance at university workshops on ethics” in the “other” category.

Participants were then asked to choose their three most-often used instructional techniques for teaching ethical and/or moral leadership principles. The top three most-often used instructional techniques for teaching ethical and/or moral principles were reported by 61.1% \((n = 11)\) of participants who chose instructor-led discussion, 50% \((n = 9)\) of participants chose traditional lecture and 50% \((n = 9)\) chose activities. These responses are recorded in Table 4-2.

From their three most-often used instructional techniques for teaching ethical and/or moral leadership principles, participants were asked to determine which specific instructional technique they perceived to be the most effective. Of the 18 participants, 17 responded. Using analysis procedures outline in Chapter 3, seven techniques were chosen (some participants listed more than one technique): activities \((n = 5)\), instructor-led discussion \((n = 4)\), student-led discussion \((n = 3)\), case studies \((n = 3)\), current events \((n = 3)\), videos \((n = 2)\) and guest lecturers \((n = 2)\).

Lastly, participants were asked to share specific ways in which they effectively used their chosen method/s for teaching ethical and/or moral leadership principles. Content analysis was used to categorize the responses. Of the 18 participants, 16 responded. Each response was listed by one participant \((n = 1)\) for each response. Participants’ specific responses included: YouTube and video clips, class debates and
presentations, popular culture items, ethics panel, service work including work with the homeless, prisoners, etc.; political role models such as presidents; industry representatives, personal journaling and mission/vision statement construction, and what-would-you-do themed activities such as specific scenarios, case studies, and game theory activities.

**Objective 2: To Identify Effective Methods for Developing Student Knowledge of Ethical and Moral Leadership Behaviors as Reported by College of Agriculture Faculty.**

The questionnaire contained four items that specifically addressed effective methods for developing student knowledge of ethical and moral leadership behaviors. Participants were asked to select specific instructional techniques they used when teaching ethical and/or moral leadership behaviors. The instructional techniques participants could choose from were identical to the instructional techniques for Objective 1 (traditional lecture, exams, quizzes, instructor-led discussion, etc.). All 18 participants responded. The responses are recorded in Table 4-3. As the table shows, one participant selected the “other” category.

Participants were then asked to choose their three most-often used instructional techniques for teaching ethical and/or moral leadership behaviors. These responses are recorded in Table 4-4. The top three most-often used instructional techniques for teaching ethical and/or moral behaviors were reported by 44.4% \( (n = 8) \) of participants who chose activities and 44.4% \( (n = 8) \) of participants chose instructor-led discussion.

From their three most-often used instructional techniques for teaching ethical and/or moral leadership behaviors, participants were asked to determine which specific instructional technique they perceived to be the most effective. Of the 18 participants, 16 responded. Using analysis procedures outline in Chapter 3, ten techniques were
chosen (some participants listed more than one technique): activities \((n = 4)\), case studies \((n = 2)\), discussion groups \((n = 2)\), guest lecturers \((n = 2)\), instructor-led discussion \((n = 2)\), role-playing/role-modeling \((n = 2)\), current events \((n = 1)\), debates \((n = 2)\), ethics panel \((n = 1)\) and popular press \((n = 1)\).

Lastly, participants were asked to share specific ways in which they effectively used their chosen method/s for teaching ethical and/or moral leadership behaviors. Content analysis was used to categorize the responses. Of the 18 participants, 14 responded. Each response was listed by one participant \((n = 1\) for each response). Participants’ specific responses included: role-playing with ethical scenarios, debates, analyzing potential places of employment’s ethical environment/s, guest lecturers who have had different experiences with different companies, news articles including recent ethical scandals such as the Penn State and UNC scandals, hot topics issues such as animal rights versus animal welfare, use of provocative videos of individuals or events, what-would-you-do themed activities.

**Objective 3: To Determine the Demographic Characteristics of Faculty who Teach Ethical and Moral Leadership in Colleges of Agriculture**

Demographic information was collected as part of the survey instrument. Twelve questions regarding demographics were used in the survey instrument. The demographical information collected was gender, age, religious attendance/affiliation, number of years teaching in a faculty position, length of time teaching ethical and/or moral leadership units, sub-units, and/or courses; whether or not participants had ever taught some component of ethics and/or morals as related to leadership; whether or not participants had taught ethical and/or moral leadership as a stand-alone or embedded course; specific embedded leadership courses participants taught; specific stand-alone
leadership courses participants taught; how long participants had taught each specific course, when participants have offered their ethical and/or moral leadership courses; the average number of students enrolled in their courses; changes in the way participants have taught ethics and/or morals as related to leadership; and lastly, education, training, or background participants received in ethical and/or moral leadership.

Of the demographic information asked of each participant, gender, age, religious attendance/affiliation, number of years teaching in a faculty position and length of time teaching ethical and/or moral leadership units, sub-units, and/or courses are reported in Table 4-5. When asked to report gender, age, religious attendance/affiliation and number of years teaching in a faculty position, all 18 participants responded. When asked to report length of time teaching ethical and/or moral leadership units, sub-units, and/or courses, one participant did not respond. Key findings include: 55.6% \((n = 10)\) of participants were male, the majority of participants were between the ages of 26 – 40, the majority of participants, 61.1% \((n = 11)\) attend/practice religious services 4 – 10 times per month, the majority of participants have been teaching in a faculty position for 1 – 9 years, and nearly half of the participants, 44.4% \((n = 8)\), have been teaching ethical and/or moral leadership units, sub-units/courses for 4 – 6 years. Other demographic information obtained from participants is provided in the following paragraphs.
Experience Teaching Some Component of Ethics and/or Morals as Related to Leadership

When asked if they had ever taught some component of ethics and/or morals as related to leadership in their leadership courses, all 18 participants, 100% (n = 18) responded “yes.”

Stand-Alone Versus Embedded

Participants were asked to respond to four questions pertaining to the difference in teaching style: stand-alone versus embedded. These four questions determined specific ways in which participants had taught ethics and/or morals as related to leadership (stand-alone versus embedded), when they offered their respective course, and if they had ever changed the way they taught (stand-alone to embedded, etc.) ethics and/or morals as related to leadership.

In what specific ways have you taught ethics as related to leadership?

For this question, 72.2% (n = 13) of the 18 participants selected that they teach ethics as related to leadership as an embedded course only (as a unit or sub-unit within another course), 16.7% (n = 3) selected that they teach ethics as related to leadership as both a stand-alone and an embedded course and 11.1% (n = 2) selected that they teach ethics as related to leadership in an “other” form. One of the participants listed that they were in the process of “teaching a stand-alone for the first time” in the “other” category.

In what specific ways have you taught morals as related to leadership?

The results for this question were identical to the previous question. Seventy-two percent (n = 13) of the 18 participants selected that they teach morals as related to leadership as an embedded course only (as a unit or sub-unit within another course),
16.7% \((n = 3)\) selected that they teach morals as related to leadership as both a stand-alone and an embedded course and 11.1% \((n = 2)\) selected that they teach morals as related to leadership in an “other” form. One of these participants listed “part of a discussion related to ethics” in the “other” category.

**Offerings of ethical and/or moral leadership as a stand-alone course**

If participants had taught ethical and/or moral leadership as a *stand-alone course*, they were asked to select specific times of the year when they offered the course. The times were categorized according to a general academic calendar (fall semester, spring semester, etc.). The responses varied among participants, although “partial summer” was listed as the least-taught-in semester. Fall, spring, and summer semesters accounted for most of the participants’ responses. These responses are recorded in Table 4-6.

**Offerings of ethical and/or moral leadership as an embedded course**

If participants had taught ethical and/or moral leadership as an *embedded course*, they were asked to select specific times of the year when they offered the course (fall semester, etc.). The choices for this question were: fall semester, spring semester, full summer semester, partial summer semester, and other. The majority of responses selected that they had offered ethical and/or moral leadership as an embedded course in the fall \((n = 14, 56\%)\) and spring semesters \((n = 16, 64\%)\).

Responses are recorded in Table 4-7.

**Changing teaching style**

Participants were asked if they had ever changed the way they taught ethics and/or morals as related to leadership. All 18 participants responded. Of the 18, 22.2%
(n = 4) had changed from an embedded course to a stand-alone course, 5.6% (n = 1) had changed to “other” and 72.2% (n = 13) had not changed at all.

Specific stand-alone leadership courses taught

Participants were asked to list specific stand-alone leadership courses that they had taught. Using analysis methods outline in Chapter 3, 23 different leadership courses were identified. These courses included: Introduction to Leadership, Personal Leadership Development, Organizational Culture and Ethics, Leadership and Imagination; Power, Motivation, and Influence; Youth Leadership Theory, Agricultural Leadership Development, Heroic Leadership, Environmental Leadership, and Team and Group Leadership.

Specific embedded leadership courses taught

Participants were also asked to list specific embedded courses they had taught that included some component of leadership. These responses were categorized according to procedures outlined in Chapter 3. Eleven different embedded courses were identified. These courses included: Team Learning, Communicating agriculture to the Public, Critical and Creative Thinking, Ethics from a World-View Perspective, Conflict Management, Humanity in the Food Web and Time Management.

Time Spent Teaching Specific Leadership Courses

After providing specific courses they had taught, participants were asked to list how long they had taught each course. All 18 participants responded. The average number of years spent teaching specific leadership courses was 11.5. The least amount of time spent teaching specific leadership courses was one year and the greatest amount of time spent teaching a specific leadership course was 23 years.
**Participants’ Background in Ethical and/or Moral Leadership**

Participants were asked to list any education, training, or background they might have had in ethical and/or moral leadership. Fourteen different answers pertaining to education, training or background in ethical and/or moral leadership were identified. Each response was listed by one participant ($n = 1$ for each response). Included in participants’ responses were: philosophy courses, workshops and seminars on business ethics, undergraduate and graduate coursework, church seminars, FFA leadership training opportunities, faculty/staff advancement seminars, community service, conference presentations, serving in administrative roles, personal advancement/education and volunteer organizations.

**Average Number of Students Enrolled in Courses**

Participants were asked to provide an average number for the amount of students enrolled in each leadership course they taught that included some component of ethics and morals. The lowest average number of students reported was 12. The highest average number of students was 120. Other participants responses ranged from about 20 – 40 students per course. Four participants’ responses were higher than 40, but less than 75.

**Use of Outside Sources for Curriculum/Course Development**

If participants had sought any type of outside source for knowledge, guidance, help etc., for ethics and/or morals in leadership curriculum and/or course development, they were asked to list those sources. Of the 18 participants, eight responded. The following are outside sources that were provided: consulting with philosophy professors, mirroring aspects of other ethics courses, such as business courses, consulted with other colleagues, references texts, articles, and case studies from other fields of study.
Objective 4: Identify Faculty Members’ Perceptions of the Terms “Ethics” and “Morals” and Determining Student Behaviors.

Description of Students Before and After Taking a Course in Ethical and/or Moral Leadership

A pair of questions that addressed the relationship between faculty perceptions and demographic characteristics asked participants to describe the majority of their students’ actions before and after taking a course in ethical and/or moral leadership.

When asked to describe the majority of their students’ actions prior to taking their course, the majority of participants, 33.3% \((n = 6)\), described them as conforming to obtain rewards, to have favors returned. It should also be noted that 22.2% \((n = 4)\) of participants described their students’ actions as obeying rules to avoid punishment. The additional participants’ responses are recorded in Table 4-8.

When asked to describe the majority of the students’ actions after taking their course, the majority of participants, 66.7% \((n = 12)\), described them as actions guided by principles commonly agreed on as essential to the public welfare; principles upheld to retain respect and peers and, thus, self-respect. None of the participants described their students’ actions as obeying rules to avoid punishment. The additional participants’ responses are recorded in Table 4-9.

Participant Definitions of “Ethics” and “Morals”

Participants were asked at the beginning of the questionnaire to give their personal definitions of “ethics” and “morals.” To determine if there were any consistencies within the definitions, each definition was placed in a category that best described it, marked with an “X”. The categories for the definitions were researcher-developed using a content analysis and were based on findings in the literature (Brown et al., 2005; Liddell and Cooper, 2012; Johnson, 2012). Within the committee, inter-
reliability was confirmed on the categories that were constructed. The categories for “ethics” definitions are: behavior, practices; personal conceptualization; and guidelines, rules. The categories for “morals” definitions are: behavior, practices; conceptualization; and guidelines, rules and beliefs. All categories presented are representative of the literature used to determine the categories (Brown et al., 2005; Liddell and Cooper, 2012; Johnson, 2012). The responses are recorded in Tables 4-10 and 4-11, respectively. As the tables show, some definitions fall into more than one category. The categories and their summative definitions are further explained in Chapter 5.

Summary

In Chapter 4, results of the survey analyzing the four research objectives were presented. Effective methods for developing student knowledge of ethical and/or moral leadership principles and behaviors were identified. Demographic characteristics of respondents and their relationship to their perceptions were also identified. Chapter 5 will provide an interpretation of the results and recommendations for future research and practice.
Table 4-1. Specific Instructional Techniques used for Teaching Ethical and/or Moral Leadership Principles. (n = 18)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Technique</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructor-led discussion</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Lecture</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>94.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>94.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current event/s activities</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>94.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case studies</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>88.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion groups</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Videos</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>72.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popular press (e.g. newspaper articles, magazine articles, etc.)</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>72.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-led discussion</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exams</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest lectures</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quizzes</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journals</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role playing/role-modeling</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simulations</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media (e.g. Facebook, Twitter)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-2. Three Most-Often Used Instructional Techniques for Teaching Ethical and/or Moral Leadership Principles (n = 18)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Technique</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructor-led discussion</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>61.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional lecture</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case Studies</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion groups</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-led discussion</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Videos</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current event/s activities</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest lecturers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newspaper articles, magazine articles, etc.</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journals</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role-playing/Role-modeling</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simulations</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Table 4-3. Specific Instructional Techniques used for Teaching Ethical and/or Moral Leadership Behaviors. (n = 18)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Technique</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Instructor-led discussion</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion groups</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>77.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional Lecture</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>72.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>72.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current event/s activities</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case studies</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>61.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-led discussion</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popular press (e.g. newspaper articles, magazine articles, etc.)</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Videos</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest lectures</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simulations</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exams</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quizzes</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role playing/role-modeling</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journals</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social media (e.g. Facebook, Twitter)</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 4-4. Three Most-Often Used Instructional Techniques for Teaching Ethical and/or Moral Leadership Behaviors. (n = 18)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Instructional Technique</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor-led discussion</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case studies</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current event/s activities</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion groups</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Traditional lecture</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest lecturers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Videos</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role-playing/Role-modeling</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simulations</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-led discussion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exams</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popular press (e.g. newspaper articles, magazine articles, etc.)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journals</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quizzes</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media (e.g. Facebook, Twitter)</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4-5. Participants’ Demographic Information. \((n = 18)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>(f)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>55.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26 – 32</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33 – 40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41 – 48</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49 – 56</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>57 or older</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Religious Attendance/Affiliation</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not attend/ practice religious services</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 3 times per month</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – 10 times per month</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>61.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of Years Teaching in a Faculty Position</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 3 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – 6 years</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 – 9 years</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>27.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 – 14 years</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 – 20 years</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 years or more</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Length of Time Teaching Ethical/Moral Leadership Units, Sub-units/courses</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 – 3 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 – 6 years</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 – 9 years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 or more years</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-6. Offerings of Ethical and/or Moral Leadership as a Stand-Alone Course. \((n = 18)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>(f)</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full summer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Other”</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial summer</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4-7. Offerings of Ethical and/or Moral Leadership as an Embedded Course. (n = 18)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Semester</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>56.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>64.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full summer</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial summer</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>24.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>“Other”</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-8. Participants’ Description of Their Students Prior to Taking Their Course. (n = 18)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obeys rules to avoid punishment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conforms to obtain rewards, to have favors returned</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conforms to avoid disapproval of others</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upholds laws and social rules to avoid censure of authorities and feelings of guilt about not “doing one's duty”</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions guided by principles commonly agreed on as essential to the public welfare; principles upheld to retain respect of peers and, thus, self-respect</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions guided by self-chosen ethical principles; principles upheld to avoid self-condemnation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4-9. Participants’ Description of Their Students After Taking Their Course. (n = 18)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Obeys rules to avoid punishment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conforms to obtain rewards, to have favors returned</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conforms to avoid disapproval of others</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upholds laws and social rules to avoid censure of authorities and feelings of guilt about not “doing one's duty”</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions guided by principles commonly agreed on as essential to the public welfare; principles upheld to retain respect of peers and, thus, self-respect</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Actions guided by self-chosen ethical principles; principles upheld to avoid self-condemnation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4-10. Participants’ Definitions of “ethics”. (*n* = 18)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Behavior, Practices</th>
<th>Personal Conceptualization</th>
<th>Guidelines, Rules</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Accepted behavior as defined by society</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Personal conceptualization of “right” and “wrong”</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>The way personal morals are translated in situations and applied in society, a set of guidelines created for industries or groups based on shared morals. For example – business ethics</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>A set of moral principles an individual lives by</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>The standard by which a person lives with respect to decision making about people, animals, and the environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Rules by which individual[s] live</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Values that society believes to be important, rules that say what is good and bad, right and wrong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Ethics are societal principles for guiding human behavior, classifying behaviors as “right” and others as “wrong”</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Practices</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>The concepts of right and wrong</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Doing the right thing.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Ethics reflect the social norms of acceptable behavior</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Guiding principles that allow an individual to make changes or choose a specific direction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Ethics is the moral values a person follows in life. What is right and wrong, good and bad. It is how a person lives their lives.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Agreed upon guidelines of behavior or practice</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Principles that guide one’s beliefs about moral actions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>A set of principles decided upon by society</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>How a person should behave</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4-11. Participants’ Definitions of “morals”. \((n = 18)\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participant</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Behavior, Practices</th>
<th>Conceptualization</th>
<th>Guidelines, Rules, Beliefs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Right versus wrong behavior</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Socialized conceptualization of “good” and “bad”</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Personal value based guidelines that direct and dictate how one would act in a situation</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>An individual’s sense of what is right and wrong or what is good and bad</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>An individual’s guiding compass determining right and wrong for given situations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>How an individual defines the differences between right and wrong</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Your own set of values that you believe to be important</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Morals are personal values that can be used to guide actions and behaviors, classifying some as “right” and others as “wrong”</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Principles – values</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Frame work to implement our belief [of] what is right and wrong.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Rules that guides one’s behaviors based on their cultural norms</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Morals reflect the alignment between one’s personal beliefs and actions and the norms of their social group</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Foundational precepts that remain consistent regardless of the situation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Morals [are] the inner rules that a person follows. It is how a person knows what to do in any given circumstance</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Personal beliefs about right and wrong</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>Personal beliefs about right and wrong (other participant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>A set of principles decided upon by a higher body</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>The “rules” that govern an individual’s behavior</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER 5
CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The purpose of this study was to determine faculty perceptions of methods for teaching ethical and moral leadership principles and behaviors in undergraduate college of agriculture courses. The dependent variable in this study was faculty members’ perceptions. Antecedent variables in this study were faculty members’ demographic characteristics. Components of Kohlberg’s Cognitive Moral Development, Rest’s Four-Component Model, and Social Learning/Cognitive Theory were used to develop the theoretical foundation for this study. According to Ryan and Bisson (2011), graduates’ poor attitudes towards ethical behavior may be a reflection of how ethics is taught [i.e. teaching practices]. This study sought to determine exactly how “ethics” and morals are taught and the specific teaching practices used by college of agriculture faculty.

Objectives

The following objectives were developed in order to guide the study:

- Objective 1: To identify effective methods for developing student knowledge of ethical and moral leadership principles as reported by college of agriculture faculty.
- Objective 2: To identify effective methods for developing student knowledge of ethical and moral leadership behaviors as reported by college of agriculture faculty.
- Objective 3: To determine the demographic characteristics of faculty who teach ethical and moral leadership in colleges of agriculture.
- Objective 4: Identify faculty members’ perceptions of the terms “ethics” and “morals” and determining student behaviors.

Methodology

The population for this study was college of agriculture faculty within departments of agricultural education who had taught some component of ethics and/or morals. After
a research-developed list was defined, 32 faculty were determined to be qualified for participation in this study. As a census study, all 32 individuals were asked to participate in the study. 25 participants initially responded. The researcher determined that only 18 participants and their entire response sets were usable, which resulted in a 56% \( (n = 18) \) response rate. The study used descriptive statistical measurements and content analyses for the purpose of data analysis.

**Summary of Findings**

**Objective 1: To Identify Effective Methods for Developing Student Knowledge of Ethical and Moral Leadership Principles as Reported by College of Agriculture Faculty**

The first objective sought to identify effective teaching methods faculty used to develop students’ knowledge of ethical and/or moral leadership principles. The following are instructional techniques that were used by half or more of the participants:

- Instructor-led discussion (100%),
- Traditional lecture (94.4%),
- Current event/s activities (94.4%),
- Activities (94.4%),
- Case studies (88.9%),
- Discussion groups (83.3%)
- Popular press (72.2%),
- Videos (72.2%),
- Student-led discussion (66.7%),
- Exams (55.6%)
- Guest lectures (55.6%),
- And quizzes (50%).

The following instructional techniques were used by less than half of participants:

- Social media,
- Journals,
- Role playing/role-modeling,
- Simulations,
- And “other”.

The top three instructional techniques used by participants were:

- Instructor-led discussion (61.1%),
- Traditional lecture (50%)
- And activities (50%).

As outlined in Chapter 4, participants were asked to choose which specific instructional technique they thought to be most effective for teaching ethical and/or moral leadership principles. Seven techniques were identified, with activities \( (n = 5) \) being the most chosen of the instructional techniques. The other techniques were:

- Instructor-led discussion \( (n = 4) \),
- Student-led discussion \( (n = 3) \),
- Case studies \( (n = 3) \),
- Current events \( (n \)
= 3), videos (n = 2) and guest lecturers (n = 2). Participants provided many responses to this question. Participants indicated they use a wide variety of specific methods to effectively use their chosen technique/s for teaching ethical and/or moral leadership principles. Participants’ responses included: YouTube and video clips, class debates and presentations, popular culture items, ethics panel, service work including work with the homeless, prisoners, etc.; political role models such as presidents; industry representatives, personal journaling and mission/vision statement construction, and what-would-you-do themed activities such as specific scenarios, case studies, and game theory activities.

**Objective 2: To Identify Effective Methods for Developing Student Knowledge of Ethical and Moral Leadership Behaviors as Reported by College of Agriculture Faculty.**

The second objective, though similar to the first, sought to identify effective teaching methods faculty used to develop students’ knowledge of ethical and/or moral leadership behaviors. Related to behaviors, the following are instructional techniques that were used by half or more of the participants: discussion groups (77.8%), instructor-led discussion (77.8%), traditional lecture (72.2%), activities (72.2%), current event/s activities (72.2%), case studies (61.1%), student-led discussion (55.6%) and popular press (50%). The following techniques were used by less than half of participants: Videos, simulations, exams, quizzes, social media, guest lecturers, journals, role playing/role-modeling, and “other”. The top two instructional techniques used by participants were: activities (44.4%) and instructor-led discussion (44.4%). When asked what specific instructional technique they thought to be most effective when teaching ethical and/or moral leadership behaviors, activities topped the list (n = 4) of the ten techniques identified, followed by case studies (n = 2), discussion groups
(n = 2), guest lecturers (n = 2), instructor-led discussion (n = 2), role-playing/role-modeling (n = 2), current events (n = 1), debates (n = 2), ethics panel (n = 1) and popular press (n = 1). For teaching ethical and/or moral leadership behaviors, participants listed a wide variety of specific ways in which they effectively use their chosen technique/s. Participants’ responses included: role-playing with ethical scenarios, debates, analyzing potential places of employment’s ethical environment/s, guest lecturers who have had different experiences with different companies, news articles including recent ethical scandals such as the Penn State and UNC scandals, hot topics issues such as animal rights versus animal welfare, use of provocative videos of individuals or events, what-would-you-do themed activities.

Objective 3: To Determine the Demographic Characteristics of Faculty who Teach Ethical and Moral Leadership in Colleges of Agriculture.

The third objective sought to determine faculty members’ demographic characteristics. Of the participants that responded, 55.6% were male, 44.4 % were female. The majority of participants were either 33 – 40 years in age (44.4%) or were 49 – 56 years in age (33.3%). The majority of participants reported that they attend/practice religious services 4 – 10 times per month. Participants’ time teaching in a faculty positions widely ranged from 1 – 21 years or more. This information can be found in Table 4-5. Participants’ time teaching ethical and/or moral leadership units, sub-units/courses was also greatly varied. 8 participants (44.4) reported that they had been teaching ethical and/or moral leadership units, sub-units/courses for 4 – 6 years. All other categories (1 – 3 years, 7 – 9 years, 10 or more years) each had a response of 16.7% (n = 3).
Research Questions

In what specific ways have you taught ethics as related to leadership?

Seventy-two percent (n = 13) of the 18 participants selected that they teach ethics as related to leadership as an embedded course only (as a unit or sub-unit within another course), 16.7% (n = 3) selected that they teach ethics as related to leadership as both a stand-alone and an embedded course and 11.1% (n = 2) selected that they teach ethics as related to leadership in an “other” form. One of the participants listed that they were in the process of “teaching a stand-alone for the first time” in the “other” category.

In what specific ways have you taught morals as related to leadership?

Results for this question were identical to the previous question. 72.2% (n = 13) of the 18 participants selected that they teach morals as related to leadership as an embedded course only (as a unit or sub-unit within another course), 16.7% (n = 3) selected that they teach morals as related to leadership as both a stand-alone and an embedded course and 11.1% (n = 2) selected that they teach morals as related to leadership in an “other” form. One of these participants listed “part of a discussion related to ethics” in the “other” category.

Offerings of ethical and/or moral leadership as a stand-alone course

The responses varied among participants of when they offered their ethical and/or moral leadership stand-alone course. “Partial summer” was selected the least amount of times for the semester in which the ethical and/or moral leadership course (stand-alone) was offered. Most of the participants’ responses fell within the fall (n = 2, 11.1%), spring (n = 3, 16.7%), or full summer (n = 3, 16.7%) semesters. Remaining
participants indicated they offer the course in the partial summer semester \((n = 1, 5.6\%)\), and “other” \((n = 3, 16.7\%)\).

**Offerings of ethical and/or moral leadership as an embedded course**

When asked when they offered their ethical and/or moral leadership course (embedded), the majority of responses selected that they had offered the course in the fall \((n = 14, 56\%)\) and spring semesters \((n = 16, 64\%)\). Remaining participants indicated they offered their course in the full summer \((n = 5, 20\%)\), the partial summer \((n = 6, 24\%)\), and “other” \((n = 3, 12\%)\).

**Changing teaching style**

Of the 18 participants, 22.2\% \((n = 4)\) had changed from an embedded course to a stand-alone course, 5.6\% \((n = 1)\) had changed to “other” and 72.2\% \((n = 13)\) had not changed their teaching style (embedded to stand-alone) at all.

**Specific stand-alone leadership courses taught**

Twenty-three different leadership courses were identified from participants responses. These courses included: Introduction to Leadership, Personal Leadership Development, Organizational Culture and Ethics, Leadership and Imagination; Power, Motivation, and Influence; Youth Leadership Theory, Agricultural Leadership Development, Heroic Leadership, Environmental Leadership, and Team and Group Leadership.

**Specific embedded leadership courses taught**

Eleven different embedded courses were identified from participant responses. These courses included: Team Learning, Communicating agriculture to the Public, Critical and Creative Thinking, Ethics from a World-View Perspective, Conflict Management, Humanity in the Food Web and Time Management.
**Time Spent Teaching Specific Leadership Courses**

Overall, participants reported an average of 11.5 years spent teaching specific ethical and/or moral leadership courses. This average may be high as one participant reported an average of 23 years for time spent teaching specific ethical and/or moral leadership courses.

**Average Number of Students Enrolled in Courses**

The lowest average number of students reported was 12. The highest average number of students was 120. Other participant’s responses ranged from about 20 – 40 students per course. Four participants reported averages higher than 40, but less than 75.

**Participants' Background in Ethical and/or Moral Leadership**

Fourteen different answers pertaining to education, training or background in ethical and/or moral leadership were identified from participants’ responses. Included in these responses were: philosophy courses, workshops and seminars on business ethics, undergraduate and graduate coursework, church seminars, FFA leadership training opportunities, faculty/staff advancement seminars, community service, conference presentations, serving in administrative roles, personal advancement/education and volunteer organizations.

**Use of Outside Sources for Curriculum/Course Development**

Of the 18 participants, eight responded and listed the following as outside sources they used for curriculum/course development: consulting with philosophy professors, mirroring aspects of other ethics courses, such as business courses, consulted with other colleagues, references texts, articles, and case studies from other fields of study.
Objective 4: Identify Faculty Members’ Perceptions of the Terms “Ethics” and “Morals” and Determining Student Behaviors.

The fourth and final objective sought to distinguish if a significant relationship existed between faculty perceptions and their demographic characteristics. Faculty were asked to describe their students prior to taking their ethical and/or moral leadership course and after. These two questions specifically identified which level and stage, according to Kohlberg’s Cognitive Theory of Moral Development, faculty members’ perceptions of their students fell into. These results and the breakdown of students’ level of moral development prior to taking their course are listed below. The 10 faculty members that described their students’ behavior as “obeys rules to avoid punishment” \( (n = 4, 22.2\%) \) or “conforms to obtain rewards, to have favors returned” \( (n = 6, 33.3\%) \) fall into Kohlberg’s lowest level of cognitive moral development: Level I which is “Preconventional Morality” and Stages 1 and 2, punishment orientation and reward orientation, respectively. Four faculty members described their students’ behavior as “conforms to avoid disapproval of others” \( (n = 3, 16.7\%) \) or “upholds law and social rules to avoid censure of authorities and guilt about not ‘doing one’s duty’” \( (n = 1, 5.6\%) \), which are categorized in Level II, which is “Conventional Morality” and Stages 3 and 4, good-boy/good-girl orientation and authority orientation, respectively. The four remaining faculty members described their students’ behavior as “actions guided by principles commonly agreed on as essential to the public welfare; principles upheld to retain respect of peers, and, thus, self-respect” \( (n = 3, 16.7\%) \) or “actions guided by self-chosen ethical principles (that usually value justice, dignity, and equality); principles upheld to avoid self-condemnation” \( (n = 1, 5.6\%) \). These fall into Kohlberg’s highest level of cognitive moral development, Level III, called “Postconventional Morality” and
Stages 5 and 6, social-contract orientation and ethical principle orientation, respectively. These responses are reported in Table 5-1.

The breakdown of faculty members’ perceptions of their students’ level of moral development after taking their course are listed below. None of the faculty described their students’ behavior as “obeys rules to avoid punishment”. One faculty member described their student’s behavior as “conforms to obtain rewards, to have favors returned” ($n = 1, 5.6\%$) which falls into the preconventional morality level and the reward orientation stage. Three faculty members described their students’ behavior as “conforms to avoid disapproval of others” ($n = 2, 11.1\%$) or “upholds law and social rules to avoid censure of authorities and guilt about not ‘doing one’s duty’” ($n = 1, 5.6\%$). These responses both fall into the Conventional morality level and good-boy/good-girl and authority orientations, respectively. The 14 remaining faculty members described their students’ behavior as “actions guided by principles commonly agreed on as essential to the public welfare; principles upheld to retain respect of peers, and, thus, self-respect” ($n = 12, 66.7\%$) or “actions guided by self-chosen ethical principles (that usually value justice, dignity, and equality); principles upheld to avoid self-condemnation” ($n = 2, 11.\%$). These responses fall into the highest level of cognitive moral development, postconventional morality and in the social-contract orientation stage and the ethical principle stage, respectively. The responses are reported in Table 5-2.

As shown by the frequencies, faculty members’ seem to have a higher perception of their students’ moral development after the students have taken their course. This indicates that faculty members perceive their course on ethical and/or
moral leadership to have a significant positive impact on students’ ethical/moral leadership behavior. This also indicates that faculty members perceive their teaching methods to be effective at teaching ethical and/or moral leadership principles and behavior. This finding, faculty members’ perceive their students’ moral development (and thus, their behavior) to increase after taking their course, supports the claim reported by Green and Weber (1997) as found in O’Fallon and Butterfield (2005), that “Higher levels of moral reasoning lead to more ethical behavior” (p. 393, Table V). This finding, that education impacts ethical and/or moral development, also supports the studies of Kracher, Chatterjee, and Lundquist, 2002; O’Fallon and Butterfield, 2005; Razzaque and Hwee, 2002; and Wu, 2003.

Faculty members were also asked to define “ethics” and “morals”. This question was asked to determine if faculty members’ perception and definitions of these terms were consistent with each other and with definitions provided by the literature in this study. As Tables 4-10 and 4-11 show, faculty members have different perceptions of what the terms “ethics” and “morals” represent. Each category highlights the major themes found within faculty members’ definitions. For example, one participant defined “ethics” as “The concepts of right and wrong”. Because the statement was defining ethics within the context of an entity conceptualizing it, the definition fell within the personal conceptualization category. Similarly, one participant defined “morals” as “your own set of values that you believe to be important”. Because this statement reflected guidelines (“values”) within a personal perspective (“your” and “you”), the definition fell into two categories: conceptualization and guidelines, rules and beliefs.

**Conclusions**

The following conclusions were based upon the results of this study:
When teaching ethical and/or moral leadership principles, most participants (50% or greater) use the following instructional techniques: traditional lecture, exams, quizzes, instructor-led discussion, student-led discussion, discussion groups, activities, videos, guest lecturers, current event/s activities, popular press, and case studies. Less than half of college of agriculture faculty members use social media, journals, role playing/role-modeling, simulations and other. College of agriculture faculty use instructor-led discussion, traditional lecture and activities the most when teaching ethical and/or moral leadership principles.

Participants perceive seven particular techniques to be effective when teaching ethical and/or moral leadership principles: activities, instructor-led discussion, student-led discussion, case studies, current events, videos, and guest lecturers.

When teaching ethical and/or moral leadership behaviors, participants (50% or greater) use the following instructional techniques: traditional lecture, instructor-led discussion, student-led discussion, discussion groups, activities, current event/s activities, popular press and case studies. Less than half of college of agriculture faculty members use exams, quizzes, videos, social media, guest lecturers, journals, role playing/role-modeling, simulations, and other. College of Agriculture faculty use activities and instructor-led discussion the most when teaching ethical and/or moral leadership behaviors.

Participants perceive 10 particular techniques to be effective when teaching ethical and/or moral leadership behaviors: activities, case studies, discussion groups, guest lecturers, instructor-led discussion, role playing/role-modeling, current events, debates, ethics panel ("other"), and popular press.

When teaching both ethical and/or moral leadership principles and behaviors, participants incorporate a wide variety of techniques to effectively use their instructional methods.

The majority of participants were male. The majority of participants were between the ages of 26 – 40.

The majority of participants attend/practice religious services.

More than half of participants have been teaching in a faculty position 1 – 9 years. Most participants have been teaching ethical and/or moral leadership units, sub-units/courses for 4 – 6 years.

All participants had some experience teaching a component of ethical and/or morals as related to leadership.

The majority of participants teach or have taught ethics and morals as related to leadership as an embedded course only (as opposed to stand-alone). The majority of participants taught these embedded courses in the fall and spring.
The majority of participants have had some previous teaching experience with stand-alone and/or embedded courses.

- The majority of participants have never changed their teaching style.

- Specific stand-alone leadership courses taught: Participants were asked to list specific stand-alone leadership courses they had taught. 23 different leadership courses were identified. These courses included: Introduction to Leadership, Personal Leadership Development, Organizational Culture and Ethics, Leadership and Imagination; Power, Motivation, and Influence; Youth Leadership Theory, Agricultural Leadership Development, Heroic Leadership, Environmental Leadership, and Team and Group Leadership.

- Specific embedded leadership courses taught: Participants were also asked to list specific embedded courses they had taught that included some component of leadership. Eleven different embedded courses were identified. These courses included: Team Learning, Communicating agriculture to the Public, Critical and Creative Thinking, Ethics from a World-View Perspective, Conflict Management, Humanity in the Food Web and Time Management.

- The majority of participants have spent an average of 11.5 years teaching their respective leadership courses.

- The majority of participants had some type of background, education, training, etc. in ethical and/or moral leadership.

- The average number of students enrolled in courses varied: the lowest average number of students reported was 12. The highest average number of students was 120. Other participant’s responses ranged from about 20 – 40 students per course. Four participants reported averages higher than 40, but less than 75.

- Among participants’ responses, there was not a significant average number of students enrolled in their leadership courses that contained some component of ethics and/or morals. The lowest average number of students reported was 12. The highest average number of students was 120.

- A little less than the majority of participants sought any type of outside sources for knowledge, guidance, etc. when developing their ethical and/or moral leadership courses. The outside sources that participants provided were: consulting with philosophy professors, mirroring aspects of other ethics courses, such as business courses, consulted with other colleagues, references texts, articles, and case studies from other fields of study.

- The majority of participants described their students’ behavior prior to taking their course as punishment and reward oriented, which categorizes the students in the lowest level of cognitive moral development, preconventional Morality, according to Kohlberg’s Cognitive Theory of Moral Development.
• The majority of participants described their students’ behavior after taking their course as social-contract and ethical principle oriented, which categorizes the students in the highest level of cognitive moral development, postconventional morality, according to Kohlberg’s Cognitive Theory of Moral Development.

• Participant definitions of “ethics” and “morals” varied significantly.

Discussion and Implications

Society continues to demand ethical and moral leaders and academic institutions are revisiting their ethical and moral leadership education of their students in an attempt to produce to the needs of society. Research studies, similar to this thesis, help institutions, administration, faculty and employers gauge the level of ethical and moral leadership development in their students, ascertain problems or holes in educational curriculum, and provide solutions for these entities to address these problems and fill the gaps. One of these “gaps” is present in where and how ethical and moral leadership is taught. Many academic institutions house their “ethical leadership” programs within their business schools, but leadership, especially ethical and moral leadership, should not be confined to a singular academic entity and research has shown that specific academic environments, such as different colleges have a direct impact on individual moral judgment and behavior growth (King & Mayhew, 2002). Learning how to make ethical decisions and practice sound moral principles is important for all members of society and the specific context and environments in which it is taught is a direct reflection of how students learn in an academic setting. In addition, ethical and moral leadership curriculum could benefit from fresh teaching techniques. This study has sought to help in this endeavor by providing results based on what college of agriculture faculty perceive to be effective teaching methods for ethical and moral leadership principles and behaviors. As described by King and Mayhew (2002), unique academic
environments, like colleges of agriculture, will affect student moral behavior growth, and in turn, affect how they practice ethical and moral leadership behaviors in society.

In this study, all 18 participants were college of agriculture faculty within departments of agricultural education who had taught some component of ethics and morals as related to leadership. Each participant answered demographic questions and listed specific courses they had taught, whether stand-alone or embedded, that were related to ethical and/or moral leadership. In addition, participants also reported how they taught these courses, including if they sought outside help in developing the course, from whom, what instructional techniques they used and how they perceived them to be effective. When asked to report how they specifically taught ethics as related to leadership and morals as related to leadership, faculty members’ responses were identical. This indicates that no new instructional methods or strategies are being used to differentiate learning between the two. Since ethical leadership is different from moral leadership (as defined in this study), it seems only logical that faculty members should at least consider using different methods for the different subjects. Using the same instructional methods leaves room for concepts and critical information to fall through the gaps.

As depicted in this study’s conceptual model (presented in Chapter 2), religion is one of the external influences that directly impacts an individual’s values and beliefs, which in turn impact their moral development. As reported by O’Fallon and Butterfield (2005), Wimalasiri, Pavri, and Jalil’s 1996 findings indicated that “significant relationship between higher stages of moral reasoning and higher degree of religious commitment existed” (p. 385, Table III). This is consistent with this study’s conceptual model,
highlighting the connection between religion and moral development. Though no conclusions can be made about the relationship between level of religious attendance/practice and the effectiveness of participants’ ability to teach ethical and/or moral leadership principles and behavior, it should be noted that of the 18 participants, an overwhelming majority of them, \( n = 16 \) reported that they attend/practice religious services 1 – 10 times per month. This suggests that these participants are involved in some type of religious commitment, and therefore have a higher stage of moral reasoning and can perhaps better articulate and justify that reasoning to their students than those participants who reported that they do not attend/practice religious services. This finding also supports Singhapakdi, Marta, Rallapalli, and Rao’s 2000 study, as reported by O’Fallon and Butterfield (2005), which found that there was a positive relationship between the perception of an ethical problem and religion” (p. 378, Table II).

Though religion may play a part in ethical and/or moral development, education also plays a role. Kohlberg, a main contributor to this thesis’ theoretical foundation, explored how education can affect an individual’s ethical and moral development and ability to deal with ethical issues (Sims and Felton, 2005). A large part of the existing literature on ethical and moral leadership development discusses how ethical and moral leadership development is taught and if it has any impact on students’ attitude and behavior towards ethical and moral leadership. Ryan and Bisson (2011) stated that it is not an issue of whether ethics can be taught, but rather how it is delivered that might affect students’ and recent graduates’ attitudes. If society expects more ethical and moral leaders, these “attitudes” need to be well-informed and positive. This study
sought to determine exactly how college of agriculture faculty teach ethical and/or moral leadership and what they perceive to be effective for the development of students’ ethical and moral leadership principles and behaviors.

Of the 18 participants, 72.2% have never changed their teaching style from an embedded course to a stand-alone course or vice versa. 22.2% have changed from an embedded course to a stand-alone course and 5.6% had changed to an “other” course format. These responses spark some interest. Mainly, why did participants switch teaching styles or course formats? Was it required by their administration? Did they feel the change was more effective for teaching and learning purposes? More research analyzing the effectiveness of stand-alone versus embedded courses is needed.

Additionally, key findings of the demographic information indicated that the majority of faculty members have had some experience and/or background with ethical and/or moral leadership. The majority of faculty members have also been teaching in a faculty position for six or more years and have been teaching some component of ethical and/or moral leadership for four or more years. With this information, it seems likely that the majority of faculty members have experience teaching some component of ethical and/or moral leadership, suggesting they should be well aware of which instructional methods have proven to not be effective in their classrooms. The information reported suggested otherwise: that the majority of faculty members are using the same instructional methods and that they perceive their students’ cognitive moral development to be dramatically increasing and improving because of their instructional methods.
Participants listed that they use the following methods to teach ethical and/or moral leadership *principles*: traditional lecture, exams, quizzes, instructor-led discussion, student-led discussion, discussion groups, activities, videos, social media (e.g. Facebook, Twitter), guest lecturers, current event's activities, journals, role playing/role-modeling, popular press (e.g. newspaper articles, magazine articles), simulations, and case studies. Of these techniques, the three most-often used techniques were reported as instructor-led discussion, traditional lecture, and activities. According to Keller (2007), the top two most-often-used techniques would fall into “transactional” teaching methods which are more traditional and are not preferred by students. This finding suggests that faculty may be approaching the delivery of ethical and/or moral leadership incorrectly. If faculty are not teaching to students’ preferred learning styles, a disconnect or barrier may exist and critical information regarding ethical and/or moral leadership principles, the foundational knowledge, may not reach students. If these foundational ethical and/or moral leadership principles are not learned and internalized by students, then society cannot expect them to lead in an ethical or moral manner. The majority of faculty listed activities and instructor-led discussion to be the most effective instructional techniques for teaching ethical and/or moral leadership principles. This finding suggests a mix of transactional or traditional and what Keller (2007) called “transformational” or non-traditional teaching techniques used for teaching ethical and/or moral leadership principles. While Keller’s 2007 study showed that students prefer transformational or non-traditional teaching methods, both may be necessary for the delivery of important information, though the transformational teaching
method, in this case activities, may keep students engaged more and help aid the application process.

Participants’ perceptions of effective teaching methods for ethical and/or moral leadership behaviors are very similar to those of principles. Participants listed that they use instructor-led discussion and activities the most when teaching ethical and/or moral leadership behaviors. Among the least-used instructional techniques were transformational instructional techniques: student-led discussion, journals, and social media. Also low on the list was role playing/role-modeling which Brown and Treviño (2006) suggested as a process essential to “vicarious” learning of ethical and moral leadership, which they stated as “particularly important for learning about ethical and unethical behavior in organizational contexts (Brown & Treviño, 2006, p. 598). Lee and Cheng (2012) also supported this suggestion and noted that learning occurs from observing others’ actions and consequences. As noted by Jagger’s 2011 study, skills-based learning approaches, such as case studies, are more effective. This study shows that techniques reported to be effective in literature in developing ethical and/or moral leadership principles or behaviors, such as role playing and simulations (Sims, 1991); role-modeling (Wright, 1995) case studies (Jagger, 2011); and videos (Ryan & Bisson, 2011) are not being used by faculty as top priority teaching methods.

What Instructional techniques research is suggesting to be effective and what faculty members’ perceive to be effective are not lining up. This suggests that faculty should consider placing more emphasis on transformational or non-traditional types of instructional techniques when teaching ethical and/or moral leadership principles and behaviors. As the literature suggests, transformational instructional techniques may be
the key to bridging the transfer gap between theory and application and can offer better avenues for incorporating the external influences that affect an individual’s cognitive moral development (presented in this study’s conceptual model). Though direct incorporation of these external influences may spur difficult or nontraditional conversations among students, students prefer nontraditional methods and the conversations that take place may help students to better defend their ethical and/or moral judgment in the real world. More research in this area is needed.

A large part of this study looked at how faculty members perceive their students’ reasoning behind their actions both prior to completing their course in ethical and/or moral leadership and after completing their course. As briefly suggested earlier, this study showed that faculty members perceive their students’ reasoning and level of cognitive moral development to be lower—ranking near the preconventional level of cognitive moral development—prior to taking their course. The study also found that faculty members perceive their students’ reasoning and level of cognitive moral development to be significantly higher—ranking near the postconventional level of cognitive moral development—after taking their course. This finding supports Wu’s 2003 study as reported by O’Fallon and Butterfield (2005) which found an increase in ethical recognition after receiving a business ethics education. Maeda, Thoma, and Bebeau’s 2009 study and Cloninger and Selvarajan’s 2010 study reported student’s demonstrating better ethical judgment after a course focusing on ethics.

Though faculty may be correct in perceiving an increase in cognitive moral development and reasoning after taking their course, such a drastic increase from a preconventional level to a postconventional level raises concerns. The researcher finds
it unlikely that in single semester, a student can jump from the earliest stage of preconventional morality—obeying rules to avoid punishment—all the way to one of the highest stages of postconventional morality which is described as actions guided by principles commonly agreed on as essential to the public welfare; principles upheld to retain self-respect of peers and, thus, self-respect. As stated in Chapter 2, Kohlberg notes that many individuals never progress beyond Level II (Baxter & Rarick, 1987).

Lastly, this study noted the difference between faculty members’ definitions of the terms “ethics” and “morals.” As noted in the tables in Chapter 4 and discussed previously in this chapter, faculty members’ definitions of these terms seem to fall into a few broad categories. Some definitions of “ethics” and “morals” are remarkably similar to each other, suggesting that a clear understanding of these terms among faculty has not yet been reached. Other definitions seem to be the exact opposite of what the terms ethics and/or morals mean (according to the definitions provided for this study). For example, this study defined morals as: “morals, which they [philosophers] describe as specific standards [emphasis added] of right and wrong. . .” (Johnson, 2012, p. xxi). In this study, morals were operationally defined as meaning the application of those principles [right and wrong] according to moral standards (i.e. the application resulting in “good”/“bad” result or action). One participant however, defined morals as: “an individual’s sense of what is right and wrong or [emphasis added] what is good and bad” This particular definition clearly indicates that the participant is meshing the meaning of ethics into the definition of morals, clouding the boundary between the two words. If faculty members are not crystal clear on the subject matter they are teaching, how can they convey the proper definitions for these terms to their students and how can
students gain a strong understanding of how to apply these terms to their reasoning and behavior? Because these terms seemed to be used interchangeably often, should academia stop trying to differentiate between the terms?

A note about the research process: while collecting population information, it was surprising to learn that a complete list of all college of agriculture leadership faculty members did not exist. As noted in Chapter 3, the researcher was unable to include some leadership faculty in the study if there was not any contact information available for them. Also, it should be noted that some institutions’ web pages or departmental pages were outdated and/or did not provide any contact information for appropriate persons. As a researcher, this was a hindrance as resources to learn of the population (specific persons) and how to contact them were limited.

**Recommendations**

Recommendations for practice and future research are provided as a result of the analyzing the faculty members’ perceptions of effective methods for teaching ethical and/or moral leadership principles and behaviors, identifying faculty members’ definitions of “ethics” and “morals,” and identifying faculty members’ perceptions of student’s behaviors.

**Recommendations for Practice**

- In developing course content, faculty members should continue to seek outside help and guidance and offer to collaborate with other sources of knowledge, such as schools of business and philosophy, to better develop ethical and moral leadership curriculum.

- Faculty members should work to integrate and base their curriculum development on sound ethical or moral developmental theories. Many theoretical foundations exist within the literature and faculty members should research these theories to gain a deeper understanding of what ethical and moral leadership means, how individual ethical and moral growth occurs, and to identify specific
theories that are particular relevant to their course objectives, curriculum, and end-of-course goals.

- Ethical and/or moral leadership should be taught as a stand-alone course to ensure that enough attention is given to the topic, ample time is provided for developed discussions and transformational learning techniques (e.g. role playing) and students have the opportunity to complete a long-term ethical and/or moral leadership activity (e.g. personal code of ethics, etc.).

- Faculty members should clarify their own understanding and definitions of the terms “ethics” and “morals” and seek to incorporate clear meaning throughout their ethical and moral leadership course content.

- Educational administration at all levels (departmental, university, etc.) should provide educational workshops, programs and resources to faculty members who have some connection with ethical and/or moral leadership through teaching or otherwise. University-provided educational programming should be accessible to all faculty members throughout the year (as opposed to offering a single workshop at the beginning of a semester).

- Enrollment limitations resulting in smaller course sizes should be considered to promote active discussion, teamwork, transfer of knowledge, to encourage the sharing of personal situations or examples that theory could be applied to, and to better prepare students for real-world scenarios in which they might have to base their ethical and/or moral decisions off the opinions or moral stage of a group.

- Faculty members should consider using more transformational teaching styles to appeal to their students, engage them in discussion and behavior-related and skills-based activities, and communicate ethical and moral leadership principles and behaviors clearly.

- An additional teaching practice that faculty members should consider for their students is the development and use of personal managerial codes or personal codes of ethics.

- Faculty members should find ways to directly integrate external influences shown in this study’s conceptual model, such as religion, into their course content. Faculty members might consider inviting peers or family members to present on their past ethical and/or moral actions, exploring a church’s ethical and/or moral protocol, analyzing workplace codes of ethics, having students design an ethical and/or moral leadership activity for the Boy Scouts of America, etc.

- Faculty members should survey their students’ current cognitive moral development level prior to and after taking their course on ethical and/or moral leadership development. This could be done through a pre-test and post-test of students prior to and after taking their course. Faculty members should work towards increasing their students’ level of cognitive moral development, thereby
increasing their awareness of ethical issues and ethical responses to those issues.

**Recommendations for Future Research**

- More research should be conducted on how to define “ethics” and “morals” and how the meanings of these terms can change according to context.

- Research should be conducted on what instructional techniques are *most effective* for teaching ethical and/or moral leadership principles *and* behaviors.

- This study focused solely on *faculty* perceptions of methods for teaching ethical and/or moral leadership practices and behaviors; a follow-up study should be conducted to determine *student* perceptions of faculty members’ methods for teaching ethical and/or moral leadership practices and behaviors. Exit interviews may be useful for the follow-up study. Exit interviews would allow students to share what they learned and their perceptions of what they believed to be effective teaching methods for the course.

- More research should be conducted to find out why faculty members use the ethical and moral leadership instructional techniques they do and why they perceive them to be effective. Larger sample sizes or populations could aid in this research.

- More research is analyzing the differences and effectiveness of stand-alone course versus embedded courses is needed.

- Additional research should be conducted to specifically measure if and how individual ethical and/or moral leadership behavior is impacted by taking a course or unit in ethical and/or moral leadership.

- There were many external influences present in this study’s conceptual model. More research is needed to analyze what effect these influences have on an individual’s ethical and/or moral leadership reasoning and behavior and if they adequately account for personal experiences.

- Future studies should further explore the conceptual model presented within this study and work with employers and other stakeholders to confirm and improve the model.

- Additional research studies should be conducted among other academic units that teach ethical and moral leadership such as schools of business or liberal arts colleges and compared to this study. Academic units that are thought to have not traditionally taught ethical and moral leadership should also be explored as the teaching of ethical and moral leadership is not confined to just business schools.
• More research is needed in order to effectively evaluate if academic institutions are preparing ethically and morally sound leaders for society.

• This study sought to aid in the American Association for Agricultural Education's National Research Agenda: Agricultural Education and Communication 2011-2015 by furthering Research Priority Area (RPA) 3: Sufficient Scientific and Professional Workforce that Addresses the Challenges of the 21st Century. This study aided in a specific area of focus: “Developing the models, strategies, and tactics that best prepare, promote, and retain new professionals who demonstrates content knowledge, technical competence, moral boundaries, and cultural awareness coupled with communication and interpersonal skills.” This study aided the RPA 3 by identifying faculty perceptions of effective teaching methods for ethics and morals in leadership. Identification of these methods will help in developing stronger curriculum and will, in turn, prepare, promote, and help new professionals retain moral boundaries.
Table 5-1. Participants’ Description of Their Students Prior to Taking Their Course (n = 18)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Kohlberg’s Levels and Stages of Cognitive Moral Development</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>f</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Level I: Preconventional Morality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1: Punishment orientation</td>
<td>Obeys rules to avoid punishment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2: Reward orientation</td>
<td>Conforms to obtain rewards, to have favors returned</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>33.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level II: Conventional Morality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 3: Good-boy/good-girl orientation</td>
<td>Conforms to avoid disapproval of others</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 4: Authority orientation</td>
<td>Upholds laws and social rules to avoid censure of authorities and feelings of guilt about not “doing one’s duty”</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Level III: Postconventional Morality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 5: Social contract orientation</td>
<td>Actions guided by principles commonly agreed on as essential to the public welfare; principles upheld to retain respect of peers and, thus, self-respect</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 6: Ethical principle orientation</td>
<td>Actions guided by self-chosen ethical principles; principles upheld to avoid self-condemnation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kohlberg’s Levels and Stages of Cognitive Moral Development</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>$f$</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level I: Preconventional Morality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 1: Punishment orientation</td>
<td>Obeys rules to avoid punishment</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 2: Reward orientation</td>
<td>Conforms to obtain rewards, to have favors returned</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level II: Conventional Morality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 3: Good-boy/good-girl orientation</td>
<td>Conforms to avoid disapproval of others</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 4: Authority orientation</td>
<td>Upholds laws and social rules to avoid censure of authorities and feelings of guilt about not “doing one’s duty”</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Level III: Postconventional Morality</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 5: Social contract orientation</td>
<td>Actions guided by principles commonly agreed on as essential to the public welfare; principles upheld to retain respect of peers and, thus, self-respect</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stage 6: Ethical principle orientation</td>
<td>Actions guided by self-chosen ethical principles; principles upheld to avoid self-condemnation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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APPENDIX B
INSTRUMENTATION

Please read the following consent document carefully before you decide to participate in this study.

Purpose of the research study: The purpose of this study is to determine faculty perceptions for teaching ethical and moral leadership behaviors in undergraduate college of agriculture courses.

What you will be asked to do in this study: You will be asked to complete the Ethical and Moral Leadership Perceptions Instrument (Smith, 2012).

Time required: The Ethical and Moral Leadership Perceptions Instrument will take about 10 minutes to complete.

Risks and Benefits: There are no anticipated risks or benefits to participating in this study.

Compensation: There is no compensation for participating in this study.

Confidentiality: Your identity will be kept confidential to the extent provided by law. Your information will be assigned a code number which will not be connected to any identifiers.

Voluntary participation: Your participation in this study is completely voluntary. There is no penalty for not participating.

Right to withdraw from the study: You have the right to withdraw from the study at anytime without consequence.

Whom to contact if you have questions about the study: McKenzie W. Smith, Graduate Assistant, Department of Agricultural Education and Communication, P.O. Box 110540 Gainesville, FL 32611-0540.

Whom to contact about your rights as a research participant in the study: UF IRB02 Office, Box 112250, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611-2250; phone (352) 392-0433.
Q1
Ethical and moral leadership is a relatively new field within leadership. Have you ever taught some component of ethics and/or morals as related to leadership in your leadership courses?
- Yes
- No

Q2
In your own words, please define "ethics."

Q3
In your own words, please define "morals."

For the purposes of this survey, please use the following definitions:

**Ethical Leadership**: “…ethical leadership is defined as ‘the demonstration of normatively appropriate conduct through personal actions and interpersonal relationships, and the promotion of such conduct to followers through two-way communication, reinforcement, and decision-making’” (Brown et al., 2005, p. 120).

**Ethics**: “The term ethics refers to judgments about whether human behavior is right or wrong….ethics, which they [philosophers] define as the systematic study of the principles of right and wrong behavior, . . .” (Johnson, 2012, p. xxi). In this study, ethics was operationally defined as meaning the identification of right and wrong principles.

**Morals**: “and morals, which they [philosophers] describe as specific standards of right and wrong” (Johnson, 2012, p. xxi). In this study, morals was operationally defined as the application of ethical principles to moral standards.

**Course**: A full course devoted to the teaching of one subject.

**Unit**: A part of a course devoted to the teaching of a subject, or theory, etc.

**Sub-unit**: A component that comprises a full unit; where additional subjects, theories or knowledge are presented.

**Stand-alone**: A course is devoted entirely to the teaching of one subject (i.e. Leadership 101).

**Embedded**: A subject is embedded as a unit or sub-unit within another course (i.e. Teamwork or Communication).

**Ethical and/or moral leadership principles**: Ideas, theories, or information related to ethical and/or moral leadership.

**Ethical and/or moral leadership behaviors**: The application of ethical and/or moral leadership principles

Q4
What stand-alone leadership courses have you taught?

Q5
What embedded leadership courses have you taught?
Q6
How long have you been teaching each of the leadership courses you listed in the previous question?

Q7
Please describe any education, training, or background you have had in ethical and/or moral leadership. If none, please write "None."

Q8
In what specific ways have you taught ethics as related to leadership?
- As a stand-alone course (taught as the sole subject of a course)
- As an embedded course (as a unit or sub-unit within another course)
- Both
- Other

Q9
In what specific ways have you taught morals as related to leadership?
- As a stand-alone course (taught as the sole subject of a course)
- As an embedded course (as a unit or sub-unit within another course)
- Both
- Other

Q10
In regards to the previous questions, have you ever changed the way you teach ethics and/or morals as related to leadership? (E.g. changed from a stand-alone to embedded)
- Stand-alone to embedded.
- Embedded to stand-alone.
- Other
- I have not changed.

Q11
If you have taught ethical and/or moral leadership as a stand-alone course, please select when you have offered the course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Fall semester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spring semester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full summer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>semester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial summer semester (e.g. &quot;mini-semester&quot;)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q12**
If you have taught ethical and/or moral leadership as embedded within another course, please select when you have offered the course.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Fall semester</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring semester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Full summer semester</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partial summer semester (e.g. &quot;mini-semester&quot;)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Q13**
How long have you been teaching ethical and/or moral leadership units, sub-units and/or courses?

- < 1 year
- 1 - 3 years
- 4 - 6 years
- 7 - 9 years
- 10+ years

**Q14**
In developing your ethical and/or moral leadership unit or course curriculum and instructional techniques, have you ever sought knowledge, guidance, help, etc. from sources outside of the college or school that you teach in?

For example, if you teach in the College of Agriculture and you seek/have sought guidance from the Business School, etc.

- Yes
- No
Q15
Please explain how you have sought knowledge, guidance, help, etc. from outside sources.

Q16
Please explain how you have sought knowledge, guidance, help, etc. from outside sources.

Q17
Please explain how you have sought knowledge, guidance, help, etc. from outside sources.

Q18
When teaching ethical and/or moral leadership principles, what specific instructional techniques have you used? Remember to use the following definition:

**Ethical and/or moral leadership principles:** Ideas, theories, or information related to ethical and/or moral leadership.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional lecture</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exams</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quizzes</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor-led discussion</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-led discussion</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion groups</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Videos</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media (e.g. Facebook, Twitter)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest lecturers</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current event/s activities</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journals</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role-playing/ Role-modeling</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popular press (e.g. Newspaper articles, magazine articles, etc.)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simulations</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case studies</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q19
Of the activities you previously chose for teaching ethical and/or moral leadership principles, which THREE do you use the most often? Please click and drag your choices into the box on the right.

Items
» Traditional lecture
» Exams
» Quizzes
» Instructor-led discussion
» Student-led discussion
» Discussion groups
» Activities
» Videos
» Social Media (e.g. Facebook, Twitter)
» Guest lecturers
» Current event/s activities
» Journals
» Role-playing/ Role-modeling
» Popular press (e.g. Newspaper articles, magazine articles, etc.)
» Simulations
» Case studies
» Other:

Q20
Of the specific instructional techniques you chose, which do you perceive to have been the most effective for developing student knowledge of ethical and/or moral leadership principles? Please explain why you feel they are effective. There is not a numerical limit, please explain all techniques you feel are most effective.

Remember to use the following definition:
**Ethical and/or moral leadership principles:** Ideas, theories, or information related to ethical and/or moral leadership.

Q21
Related to the previous question, please share a few specific ways you effectively use each chosen method
Q22
When teaching ethical and/or moral leadership **behaviors**, what specific instructional techniques have you used?

Remember to use the following definition:

**Ethical and/or moral leadership behaviors:** The application of ethical and/or moral leadership principles.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Technique</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Traditional lecture</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exams</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quizzes</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Instructor-led discussion</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student-led discussion</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discussion groups</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activities</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Videos</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social Media (e.g. Facebook, Twitter)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guest lecturers</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current event/s activities</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Journals</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Role-playing/ Role-modeling</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Popular press (e.g. Newspaper articles, magazine articles, etc.)</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Simulations</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Case studies</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other:</td>
<td>☐</td>
<td>☐</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q23
Of the activities you previously chose for teaching ethical and/or moral leadership behaviors, which THREE do you use the most often? Please click and drag your choices into the box on the right.

Items
» Traditional lecture
» Exams
» Quizzes
» Instructor-led discussion
» Student-led discussion
» Discussion groups
» Activities
» Videos
» Social Media (e.g. Facebook, Twitter)
» Guest lecturers
» Current event/s activities
» Journals
» Role-playing/ Role-modeling
» Popular press (e.g. Newspaper articles, magazine articles, etc.)
  » Simulations
  » Case studies
  » Other:

Q24
Of the specific instructional techniques you chose, which do you perceive to have been the most effective for developing student knowledge of ethical and/or moral leadership behaviors? Please explain why you feel they are effective. There is not a numerical limit, please explain all techniques you feel are most effective.

Remember to use the following definition:
**Ethical and/or moral leadership behaviors:** The application of ethical and/or moral leadership principles.

Q25
Related to the previous question, please share a few specific ways you effectively use each chosen method:

Q26
Please choose a selection that BEST describes the majority of your students PRIOR to taking your course (whether stand-alone or embedded).

- [ ] Obey rules to avoid punishment
- [ ] Conforms to obtain rewards, to have favors returned
- [ ] Conforms to avoid disapproval of others
☐ Upholds laws and social rules to avoid censure of authorities and feelings of guilt about not "doing one's duty"
☐ Actions guided by principles commonly agreed on as essential to the public welfare; principles upheld to retain respect of peers and, thus, self-respect
☐ Actions guided by self-chosen ethical principles; principles upheld to avoid self-condemnation

Q27
Please choose a selection that BEST describes the majority of your students AFTER taking your course (whether stand-alone or embedded).
☐ Obey rules to avoid punishment
☐ Conforms to obtain rewards, to have favors returned
☐ Conforms to avoid disapproval of others
☐ Upholds laws and social rules to avoid censure of authorities and feelings of guilt about not "doing one's duty"
☐ Actions guided by principles commonly agreed on as essential to the public welfare; principles upheld to retain respect of peers and, thus, self-respect
☐ Actions guided by self-chosen ethical principles; principles upheld to avoid self-condemnation

Q28
Gender:
☐ Male
☐ Female

Q29
Age:
☐ 18 - 25
☐ 26 - 32
☐ 33 - 40
☐ 41 - 48
☐ 49 - 56
☐ 57+

Q30
Please choose from the following to describe your religious attendance/participation:
☐ None
Attend or practice religious services 1-3 times per month
Attend or practice religious services 4-10 times per month
Attend or practice religious services 10-20 times per month
Attend or practice religious services 20+ times per month

Q31
Number of years teaching in a faculty position:
- < 1 year
- 1 - 3 years
- 4 - 6 years
- 7 - 9 years
- 10 - 12 years
- 12 - 14 years
- 15 - 17 years
- 18 - 20 years
- 21+ years

Thank you for completing the survey! Your participation is greatly appreciated and valued!
Good afternoon [name of faculty member]!

My name is McKenzie Smith and I am a graduate student in the Department of Agricultural Education and Communication at the University of Florida. I am earning my master’s degree in leadership development. As part of my master’s degree, I am completing a thesis study titled, *Faculty Perceptions of Methods for Teaching Ethical and Moral Leadership in Undergraduate Colleges of Agriculture Courses*. My study has been approved by the University of Florida Institutional Review Board-02.

Because of your knowledge and experience with leadership/leadership education, I would greatly appreciate your participation in my study.

To measure faculty perceptions of methods for teaching ethical and moral leadership, I will be distributing an electronic survey next week.

**This email is a pre-notice** to inform you of my study and alert you to your selection in my study. Your participation is completely voluntary and all identifying information will be kept confidential. In accordance with IRB policy, any identifying information about you will be destroyed upon the completion of my study.

**Once the survey is distributed, you will have until midnight, Thursday, October 4, to complete the survey.**

To thank you for your participation in my survey, I promise to share the results of my study with you upon its completion.

Should you have any questions about my study, please contact me directly at the information listed below.

Thank you,

McKenzie W. Smith

**McKenzie W. Smith**
Leadership Development Graduate Assistant
Wedgworth Leadership Institute
Department of Agricultural Education and Communication
College of Agricultural and Life Sciences | University of Florida
Initial Contact Email

Good morning [name of faculty member]!

I hope you are doing well!

I contacted you earlier this week about participating in a survey for my thesis research. I just wanted to send out a friendly reminder for you to complete the survey by **midnight, Thursday, October 4**.

Because of your knowledge and experience with leadership/leadership education, I would greatly appreciate your participation in my study.

Your participation is completely voluntary and all identifying information will be kept confidential. In accordance with IRB policy, any identifying information about you will be destroyed upon the completion of my study.

Survey Link:
https://ufaecd.qualtrics.com/SE?Q_DL=0fyTOf4hAmK1ykd_6wXDRHggIKpNoi1__MLRP_exkJdC2pp0H5Etn

**Please complete the survey no later than: midnight, Thursday, October 4.**

To thank you for your participation in my survey, I promise to share the results of my study with you upon its completion.

Should you have any questions about my study or any problems with the survey, please contact me directly at the information listed below.

Thank you,

McKenzie W. Smith

**McKenzie W. Smith**
Leadership Development Graduate Assistant
Wedgworth Leadership Institute
Department of Agricultural Education and Communication
College of Agricultural and Life Sciences | University of Florida
First Follow-up Email

Good afternoon [name of faculty member]!

I hope you are doing well!

I recently contacted you about participating in a survey for my thesis research. I just wanted to send another friendly reminder for you to complete the survey by **midnight, Thursday, October 4**.

Because of your knowledge and experience with leadership/leadership education, I would greatly appreciate your participation in my study.

Your participation is completely voluntary and all identifying information will be kept confidential. In accordance with IRB policy, any identifying information about you will be destroyed upon the completion of my study.

Survey Link:
https://ufaecd.qualtrics.com/SE?Q_DL=0fyTOif4hAmK1ykd_6wXDRHggIKpNoi1_MLRP_exkJdC2pp0H5Etn

**Please complete the survey no later than: midnight, Thursday, October 4.**

To thank you for your participation in my survey, I promise to share the results of my study with you upon its completion.

Should you have any questions about my study or any problems with the survey, please contact me directly at the information listed below.

Thank you,

McKenzie W. Smith

**McKenzie W. Smith**
Leadership Development Graduate Assistant
Wedgworth Leadership Institute
Department of Agricultural Education and Communication
College of Agricultural and Life Sciences | University of Florida
Second Follow-up Email

Good afternoon [name of faculty member]!

I hope your day is going well! I was just writing to let you know that I am wrapping up my thesis survey and was hoping you might still be interested in completing the survey. I did call your office and left a voicemail. Feel free to call me if you have any questions or concerns.

Because of your knowledge and experience with leadership/leadership education, I would greatly appreciate your participation in my study. As a reminder and to thank you for your participation in my survey, I will be distributing my thesis results, once available, to you via email.

Your participation is completely voluntary and all identifying information will be kept confidential. In accordance with IRB policy, any identifying information about you will be destroyed upon the completion of my study.

Survey Link:
https://ufaecd.qualtrics.com/SE?Q_DL=0fyTOf4hAmK1ykd_6wXDRHgglKpNoi1_MLRP_cCTgpO2T9M3bp8p

Please complete the survey at your earliest convenience.

Should you have any questions about my study or any problems with the survey, please contact me directly at the information listed below.

Thank you,

McKenzie W. Smith

McKenzie W. Smith
Leadership Development Graduate Assistant
Wedgworth Leadership Institute
Department of Agricultural Education and Communication
College of Agricultural and Life Sciences | University of Florida
Third Follow-up Email

Good afternoon [name of faculty member]!

I hope your day is going well! I was just writing to let you know that I am wrapping up my thesis survey and was hoping you might still be interested in completing the survey. I did call your office in an attempt to contact you, but I received a message that your mailbox was full.

Because of your knowledge and experience with leadership/leadership education, I would greatly appreciate your participation in my study. As a reminder and to thank you for your participation in my survey, I will be distributing my thesis results, once available, to you via email.

Your participation is completely voluntary and all identifying information will be kept confidential. In accordance with IRB policy, any identifying information about you will be destroyed upon the completion of my study.

Survey Link:
https://ufaecd.qualtrics.com/SE?Q_DL=0fyTOf4hAmK1ykd_6wXDRHggIkpNoi1_MLRP_exkJdC2pp0H5Et

Please complete the survey at your earliest convenience.

Should you have any questions about my study or any problems with the survey, please contact me directly at the information listed below.

Thank you,

McKenzie W. Smith

McKenzie W. Smith
Leadership Development Graduate Assistant
Wedgworth Leadership Institute
Department of Agricultural Education and Communication
College of Agricultural and Life Sciences | University of Florida
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