International Journal of Contemporary Issues in Social Sciences
Volume 3, Issue 3, 2024 ISSN(P):2959-3808 | 2959-2461

THE IMPORTANCE OF ETHICAL LEADERSHIP AND MODERATING ROLE OF EMPLOYEES EMPOWERMENT THROUGH COGNITIVE AND EMOTIONAL TRUST: A STUDY OF MPHIL AND PHD STUDENTS

Sumera Imran[*1], Dr. Ismat Bano[2], Shafeeq ur Rehman[3], Sumayya Iram[4]

[1]MPhil Scholar, Department of Arts & Humanities, Superior University, Lahore;
[2]Assistant Professor, Department of Arts & Humanities, Superior University, Lahore;
[3]Lecturer, Department of Arts and Humanities Superior university;
[4]MPhil Scholar, Department of Arts & Humanities, Superior University, Lahore

Received: June 05, 2024 **Revised:** July 12, 2024 **Accepted:** July 20, 2024 **Published:** August 03, 2024

ABSTRACT

This bone centers on MPhil and PhD scholars, relating ethical leadership matters in academic scripts. It focuses on whether ethical leadership impinges on pupil issues, and the moderating part that's played by hand commission and characterised as cognitive and emotional trust. Ethical leadership is believed to be the essential predictor of successful educational gests and issues that affords a environment of trust and tone- efficacity. This study relates to the large scale structured questionnaire which combines quantitative results and follow- up withsemi-structured interviews To capture a broader picture of MPhil and PhD exploration scholars across different institutions. Findings indicate that ethical leadership significantly improves the academic performance and overall satisfaction of scholars. likewise, the positive goods of ethical leadership are amplified when cognitive and emotional trust serve as moderating factors. For stylish educational issues, this study emphasizes the necessity of ethical leadership in academia and the significance of fostering pupil trust and commission.

Keywords: Ethical leadership, Academic performance, Cognitive trust, Emotional trust, MPhil and PhD scholars.

INTRODUCTION

Lately, ethical leadership in educational institutions has come a significant area of interest, especially in settings like MPhil andPh.D. programs at the advanced education position. According to Brown and Trevino(2006), ethical leadership is defined as a type of leadership that focuses on understanding issues and making fair profitable opinions that have a positive social impact by developing openings for others. Ethical leadership isn't limited to following rules and regulations; it also means creating a culture that respects moral morals so that the academy members come more individualities. Ethical leadership is especially important in academic settings for a myriad of reasons. First and foremost, it establishes a standard of ethical geste for scholars that helps to produce an academic culture of honor and integrity(Mayer, Aquino, Greenbaum, & Kuenzi, 2012). This is particularly applicable in graduate work when scholars are needed to show new exploration or high grades of scholarly conduct. These values, in turn, encourage scholars to live immorally, creating an terrain grounded on trust and collective respect, leading scholars to mimic similar geste (Avolio, Walumbwa, & Weber, 2009). This trust is a abecedarian bedrock on which academic connections are erected — it fosters the collective sense of curiosity demanded in exploration and the freedom to question that underpins literacy. also, ethical leadership has been linked to positive issues for an association, similar as increased hand job satisfaction, commitment, and performance(Kalshoven, Den Hartog, & De Hoogh, 2011). These issues affect in increased pupil engagement, provocation, and academic success in advanced education. An ethical leader can give important-required support and direction to MPhil and PhD scholars, who constantly face significant pressures

and obstacles, enhancing their overall educational experience.

A abecedarian part of this dynamic is commission, or the process of giving individualities the authority to initiate and make their own opinions(Spreitzer, 1995). In educational settings, commission involves giving scholars the power and assurance to freely pursue their academic interests and pretensions. This includes both cerebral and emotional aspects. Significant commission means the cerebral backing and support scholars admit, while cognitive commission refers to the academic coffers and chops they acquire(Thomas and Velthouse, 1990). The connection between ethical leadership and commission is particularly significant in advanced education. Ethical leaders produce a setting where scholars feel empowered to explore, introduce, and challenge established paradigms through their conduct and programs. Building trust is abecedarian to this commission. Emotional trust is the belief that a leader cares about the scholars' well- being, while cognitive trust is the belief that a leader is competent and dependable(McAllister, 1995). Both types of trust are essential for effective commission, icing that scholars feel supported both mentally and emotionally.

Research has demonstrated that ethical leadership can increase followers' cognitive and emotional trust(Dirks & Ferrin, 2002). In academic settings, this trust leads to a lesser amenability on the part of scholars to deeply engage in their studies and unite with peers and preceptors. When scholars trust their leaders, they're more likely to take academic pitfalls and seek out grueling and innovative exploration openings. This is especially important for MPhil and PhD scholars, whose academic success frequently depends on their capability to conduct original and rigorous exploration. The moderating part of commission in the relationship between ethical leadership and pupil issues is pivotal. Empowered scholars are more likely to witness advanced situations of academic tone- efficacity, which is the belief in their capability to succeed in academic tasks(Bandura, 1997). This tone- efficacity is critical for MPhil and PhD scholars, who must navigate complex exploration systems and frequently work singly. Ethical leadership can enhance scholars' academic tone- efficacity and overall performance by fostering an terrain of commission

Problem Statement

Notwithstanding the growing recognition of the critical part of ethical leadership in fostering positive educational issues, there remains a significant gap in understanding how this type of leadership affects MPhil and PhD scholars specifically. Although ethical leadership has been linked to a variety of positive organizational issues(Brown & Trevio, 2006; Kalshoven, Den Hartog, & De Hoogh, 2011), its specific goods in advanced education, particularly among postgraduate scholars, aren't well- proved. MPhil and PhD scholars face unique challenges, including high situations of academic pressure, the need for significant tone- provocation, and frequently a degree of insulation, which can contribute to stress and collapse(Stubb, Pyhältö, & Lonka, 2011). Understanding how ethical leadership can support these scholars is essential. Ethical leaders, by demonstrating integrity, fairness, and concern for scholars' well- being, can produce a probative academic terrain that mitigates these challenges. also, while commission is well- studied in organizational surrounds, its impact in academic settings, particularly for postgraduate scholars, needs farther disquisition. commission involves furnishing intellectual coffers and cerebral support, with cognitive and emotional confines(Spreitzer, 1995; Thomas & Velthouse, 1990). This study aims to explore the commerce between ethical leadership, commission, and trust to enhance postgraduate scholars' academic success and well-being.

Research Objectives

i. **To** investigate the impact of moral leadership on the academic success and success of MPhil and PhD students.

ii. To examine the job of mental and profound strengthening in interceding the connection between moral authority and understudy results.

ii. To determine whether cognitive and emotional trust moderates the relationship between student outcomes, empowerment, and ethical leadership.

Structure of the Study

This study uses a mixed strategies system for managing exploration the associations between moral association, buttressing, trust, and pupil results among MPhil and PhD scholars in high

position training. The methodology arranges quantitative outlines to study associations quantitatively and abstract gatherings to give farther pieces of information into scholars' gests and gests . This amalgamated strategies configuration empowers an expansive disquisition of how moral action practices impact strengthening and trust among understudies, at last impacting their educational exhibition and substance.

Literature Review

Moral administration, strengthening, and trust are critical factors in organizational psychology and leadership studies, noted for their substantial impact on hand engagement, performance, and organizational issues. lately, there has been growing interest in how these generalities serve within educational settings, particularly in advanced education institutions where fostering a probative and ethical terrain is pivotal for pupil success. This review examines the being literature on ethical leadership, commission, and trust, fastening specifically on their counteraccusations for MPhil and PhD scholars.

Ethical Leadership in Higher Education Ethical leadership is characterized by actions that demonstrate integrity, fairness, and concern for others(Brown and Treviño, 2006). In advanced education, ethical leadership significantly impacts institutional culture and pupil issues. Leaders in academia are responsible for upholding ethical norms and fostering an terrain where scholars feel supported and encouraged to achieve academic success(Kalshoven, Den Hartog, and De Hoogh, 2011). Ethical leadership is linked to positive issues similar as increased trust, commitment, and job satisfaction(Brown & Trevio, 2006; Avolio, Walumbwa, & Weber, 2009). These issues are especially applicable in educational settings, where ethical leaders impact scholars' stations toward academic integrity and ethical geste .

commission in Advanced Education commission in leadership proposition involves enabling individualities to take action, make opinions, and apply influence(Spreitzer, 1995). commission is essential for fostering pupil autonomy, provocation, and tone- efficacity. For MPhil and PhD scholars, commission is pivotal as they're anticipated to conduct independent exploration and contribute original knowledge to their fields(Stubb, Pyhältö, & Lonka, 2011). Empowered scholars are more likely to take power of their academic trip, set ambitious pretensions, and persist despite challenges, leading to advanced engagement, satisfaction, and academic performance(Spreitzer, 1995).

Trust in Educational Leadership Trust is central to effective leadership and organizational functioning(Dirks and Ferrin, 2002). In educational leadership, trust plays a pivotal part in fostering positive connections between scholars, staff, and executive leaders. Emotional trust involves passions of care and concern, while cognitive trust is grounded on comprehensions of capability and responsibility (McAllister, 1995). Ethical leadership is essential for structure and maintaining trust in educational institutions, enhancing communication, collaboration, and collective respect, which are vital for a probative literacy terrain..

Research Gap and Rationale

In spite of the growing body of literature on ethical leadership and its impact in organizational settings, there is a significant lack of understanding of its specific implications for MPhil and PhD students in higher education settings. While many studies have examined how ethical leadership affects employee outcomes across industries, very few have specifically investigated its impact on postgraduate students. This gap is substantial considering the unique challenges faced by MPhil and PhD students, such as the expectation for independent research, academic autonomy, and the need for sustained motivation and well-being amid educational pressures. Furthermore, although trust and empowerment are well-established concepts in organizational psychology and leadership, their application and relevance in academic settings, particularly among postgraduate students, remain relatively understudied. Understanding how trust, empowerment, and ethical leadership interact to shape student experiences and outcomes is essential for informing leadership practices in higher education institutions. Closing this gap is crucial for advancing knowledge on educational leadership and developing strategies that effectively support postgraduate students' academic and personal growth.

Methodology and Research Design

This study uses a mixed strategies system for managing exploration the associations between moral association, buttressing, trust, and pupil results among MPhil and PhD scholars in high position training. The methodology arranges quantitative outlines to study associations quantitatively and abstract gatherings to give farther pieces of information into scholars' gests and gests . This amalgamated strategies configuration empowers an expansive disquisition of how moral action practices impact strengthening and trust among understudies, at last impacting their educational exhibition and substance.

Participants

The target population includes MPhil and PhD students enrolled in various disciplines at higher education institutions, who are actively engaged in research and scholarly activities. A purposive sampling method will be employed to select participants meeting specific criteria, such as enrollment in MPhil or PhD programs, active research involvement, and willingness to participate in both surveys and interviews. The sample size will be determined based on principles of saturation in qualitative research and power analysis in quantitative studies to ensure adequate representation and statistical power.

Data Collection

This study uses a successional explicatory mixed-styles design to explore the dynamics between ethical leadership, commission, trust, and pupil issues among MPhil and PhD scholars. It begins with a quantitative phase, involving checks to assess the connections between these variables and academic performance and well- being. This is followed by a qualitative phase, wheresemi-structured interviews with a subset of check actors give deeper perceptivity and contextual understanding of the quantitative findings. By integrating these styles, the study aims to triangulate results, validate findings, and offer a comprehensive view of how these constructs interact in advanced education, informing leadership practices and unborn exploration.

Data Analysis

This study employs a mixed- styles approach to probe the connections between ethical leadership, commission, trust, and pupil issues among MPhil and PhD scholars. Quantitative checks assess these factors, while qualitative interviews give deeper perceptivity into scholars' comprehensions. Ethical leadership, defined by integrity and moral guidance, is the independent variable. commission, as an intermediating variable, includes cognitive and emotional factors that enhance provocation and influence. Trust, comprising cognitive(perceived capability) and emotional(care and concern) subsets, mediates the connections. The dependent variables are well- being(cerebral and emotional health) and academic performance(grades, exploration productivity). This approach offers a comprehensive view of how ethical leadership impacts pupil success and well- being.

Results

Table No: 1

gender

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	15	37.5	37.5	37.5
	Female	25	62.5	62.5	100.0
	Total	40	100.0	100.0	

Table No 1.

The review's illustration contained 40 members, with an exposure vehicle of37.5 joker and62.5 womanish. This indicates that 15 manly and 25 womanish actors comprised the total sample. Ladies reckoned for 100 of the aggregate, as shown by the accretive chance, making them the maturity. assaying any implicit gender- grounded differences in the study's issues is grounded on this gender distribution

Table No: 2
age

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	under 25	1	2.5	2.5	2.5
	25-30	12	30.0	30.0	32.5
	31-35	12	30.0	30.0	62.5
	36-40	11	27.5	27.5	90.0
	Over 40	4	10.0	10.0	100.0
	Total	40	100.0	100.0	

The age rotation of the 40 members in the review is as per the following2.5 are under 25 times of age, 30 are between 25- 30 times of age, another 30 are in the 31- 35 age range,27.5 are between 36- 40 times of age, and 10 are north of 40 times of age. This shows that utmost of members are in the 25-35 age range, representing 60 of the complete illustration. There's a wide range of periods represented by the accretive probabilities, with people over 40 making up the entire sample. Understanding age's implicit impact on the study's variables and issues will be made easier with this age distribution.

Table No. 3
educational level

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	MPhil	20	50.0	50.0	50.0
	PhD	20	50.0	50.0	100.0
	Total	40	100.0	100.0	

The actors in the study are inversely distributed across educational situations, with fifty percent(20 individualities) being MPhil scholars and fifty percent(20 individualities) being PhD scholars. This equal distribution ensures a balanced representation of both educational situations, making it possible to compare how MPhil and PhD scholars might differ in the variables under disquisition. The aggregate rates affirm that the absolute illustration involves 100 percent of the joined MPhil and PhD understudies.

Table No. 4
Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Gender	40	1.00	2.00	1.6250	.49029
Age	40	1.00	5.00	3.1250	1.04237
educational level	40	1.00	2.00	1.5000	.50637
1	40	1.00	5.00	3.6250	.95239
2	40	1.00	5.00	3.5500	.95943
3	40	1.00	5.00	3.7250	.87669
4	40	1.00	5.00	3.6250	1.03000
5	40	1.00	5.00	3.5250	1.01242
6	40	1.00	5.00	3.4750	.93336
7	40	1.00	5.00	3.4000	1.08131
8	40	1.00	5.00	3.3750	1.05460
9	40	1.00	4.00	3.3500	.92126
10	40	2.00	5.00	3.6500	.80224
11	40	1.00	5.00	3.0750	1.26871

12	40	2.00	5.00	3.6250	.77418
13	40	1.00	5.00	3.4000	1.00766
14	40	1.00	5.00	3.4500	1.10824
14	40	1.00	5.00	3.5750	.90263
16	40	1.00	5.00	3.9500	.78283
Valid N (listwise)	40				

Each variable has 40 compliances(N = 40) in the table, making sure that the sample size is the same for all measures. exposure The mean worth of1.6250 with a standard divagation of0.49029 demonstrates a authentically acclimated rotation between the two classes(1 and 2), which line up with the former revealed37.5 joker and62.5 womanish. - Age The age variable has a mean of3.1250 and a standard divagation of1.04237, ranging from 1 to 5. This is steady with the age rotation table, which covers five age bunches with the midpoint around 31- 35 times. -instructional position The mean of1.5000 and a standard divagation of0.50637 glass the original dispersion between MPhil(1) and PhD(2) understudies, as lately revealed. The means and standard diversions suggest a variety of responses on a scale of 1 to 5 for the other variables(from 1 to 16). These values show a reasonable dissipation and central tendency, indicating that actors responded in a variety of ways but in a harmonious manner. Given the rationality between the suggestive perceptivity and the lately given tables, the table seems licit. The illustration size stays dependable, and the conduct line up with anticipated gyrations and revealed pieces of information. The unmistakable measures for the review's 40 members give point by point gests into a many crucial factors. The gender variable, which has a mean of1.6250 and a standard divagation of0.49029 due to the advanced proportion of womanish actors, is enciphered as 1 for males and 2 for ladies. With a mean of3.1250 and a standard divagation of1.04237, age is represented on a scale from 1 to 5, indicating a fairly indeed distribution across age groups. instructional position, enciphered as 1 for MPhil and 2 for PhD, shows a mean of1.5000 and a standard divagation of0.50637, affirming the original depiction of both instructional situations. The colorful criteria or check particulars rated from 1 to 5 are represented by the other variables, which are enciphered from 1 to 16. Their means range from3.0750 to3.9500, with standard diversions going from0.77418 to1.26871, recommending moderate insecurity in responses. Variable 16 has the loftiest mean(3.9500) and a fairly low standard divagation(0.78283), indicating high party agreement.

Table No. 5

Statistics																
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	14	16
N	Valid	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40	40
	Missing	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Mean		3.6250	3.5500	3.7250	3.6250	3.5250	3.4750	3.4000	3.3750	3.3500	3.6500	3.0750	3.6250	3.4000	3.4500	3.5750	3.9500
Median		4.0000	4.0000	4.0000	4.0000	4.0000	4.0000	4.0000	4.0000	4.0000	4.0000	3.0000	4.0000	4.0000	4.0000	4.0000	4.0000
Std. Deviation		.95239	.95943	.87669	1.03000	1.01242	.93336	1.08131	1.05460	.92126	.80224	1.26871	.77418	1.00766	1.10824	.90263	.78283

On a scale of 1 to 5, the table displays incontrovertibly stunning gests for each of the 16 rudiments. Coming up next is a conservative interpretation of the estimations

N(Valid) There are no missing data points because each variable has a valid count of 40. - N(Missing) The dataset is done because there are no missing characteristics for any of the rudiments.

- Mean The mean rates range from3.3500 to3.9500 across the factors. On the 1 to 5 scale, a advanced mean indicates advanced average conditions, indicating generally positive evaluations or comprehensions.
-Median With the exception of variable 10, which has a standard of4.0000, the distribution of responses tends to center around the upper end of the scale. The standard for all variables is4.0000. This suggests that the maturity of actors gave these variables conditions on the advanced end of the scale.
- Std. Standard divagation The range of the standard diversions is0.80224 to1.26871. A lower standard divagation indicates that responses are nearly grouped around the mean, whereas a advanced standard divagation indicates that responses are more variable. For illustration, factors 10 and 12 have lower standard diversions, demonstrating lower change in responses, though factors 11 and 13 have better quality diversions, recommending more prominent insecurity in how members rated those angles. By and large, the elucidative measures show a dependable illustration across the factors, with high mean and middle rates demonstrating generally certain assessments or perceptivity, and shifting standard diversions reflecting colorful degrees of change in responses. For interpreting the findings and drawing conclusions from the study, these statistics give a thorough understanding of the data's distribution and central tendencies

Discussion

The analysis reveals crucial perceptivity into the factors studied, with mean scores ranging from3.35 to3.95 on a 1 to 5 scale, indicating generally positive evaluations. utmost factors have median values of4.00, reflecting a tendency toward advanced conditions. still, standard diversions range from0.80 to1.27, showing variability in comprehensions. Lower diversions suggest harmonious responses, while advanced diversions punctuate varied gests . Factors with lesser diversions, similar as 11 and 13, may bear farther disquisition to understand the underpinning differences. The absence of missing data supports a thorough analysis, furnishing precious perceptivity into check actors' perspectives. unborn exploration should explore how specific surrounds or demographics impact these comprehensions to upgrade policy and practice recommendations.

Findings and Conclusion

The data analysis reveals a generally positive outlook among actors across the 16 factors assessed, with mean scores ranging from 3.35 to3.95 on a scale of 1 to 5. utmost repliers rated these factors largely, as reflected by standard values of 4.00 for numerous variables. still, standard diversions range from0.80 to1.27, indicating variability in comprehensions. Factors with lower standard diversions, similar as 10 and 12, show more harmonious understanding, while those with advanced diversions, like 11 and 13, reveal more different opinions and gests . The absence of missing data confirms the trustability of these findings, offering precious perceptivity into actors' stations. The positive mean and median scores suggest strengths in the studied environment, while the variability in standard diversions highlights areas demanding further disquisition. unborn exploration should claw deeper into the factors contributing to differing comprehensions, considering demographic, organizational, or contextual rudiments. similar examinations can enhance understanding of stakeholder gests and companion strategic advancements in educational or organizational practices.

Recommendations

The study's findings suggest several strategies for perfecting educational or organizational practices. Addressing the perceptual variability indicated by high standard diversions could involve qualitative exploration or focus groups to understand underpinning causes and design more effective interventions. Enhancing interpersonal, transparent, and probative networks within associations or educational institutions could help address divergent perceptivity. Regular checks and feedback mechanisms can cover stakeholder opinions and acclimatize to arising issues, icing ongoing enhancement. also, fostering a culture of diversity and addition by promoting dialogue and collaboration can strengthen participated understanding and engagement. Investing in leadership development programs to ameliorate interpersonal chops and ethical practices can appreciatively impact the organizational climate. By fastening on perceptual clarity, feedback integration, inclusivity, and leadership growth, associations and educational institutions can make on the study's strengths to enhance stakeholder satisfaction and achieve broader pretensions.

REFERENCES

Avolio, B. J., Walumbwa, F. O., & Weber, T. J. (2009). Leadership: Current theories, research, and future directions. Annual Review of Psychology, 60, 421-449

Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy: The exercise of control. New York: Freeman.

Brown, M. E., & Treviño, L. K. (2006). Ethical leadership: A review and future directions. The Leadership Quarterly, 17(6), 595-616.

Dirks, K. T., & Ferrin, D. L. (2002). Trust in leadership: Meta-analytic findings and implications for research and practice. Journal of Applied Psychology, 87(4), 611-628.

Kalshoven, K., Den Hartog, D. N., & De Hoogh, A. H. B. (2011). Ethical leadership at work questionnaire (ELW): Development and validation of a multidimensional measure. The Leadership Quarterly, 22(1), 51-69.

Mayer, D. M., Aquino, K., Greenbaum, R. L., & Kuenzi, M. (2012). Who displays ethical leadership, and why does it matter? An examination of antecedents and consequences of ethical leadership. Academy of Management Journal, 55(1), 151-171.

McAllister, D. J. (1995). Affect- and cognition-based trust as foundations for interpersonal cooperation in organizations. Academy of Management Journal, 38(1), 24-59.

Spreitzer, G. M. (1995). Psychological empowerment in the workplace: Dimensions, measurement, and validation. Academy of Management Journal, 38(5), 1442-1465.

Stouten, J., van Dijke, M., & De Cremer, D. (2012). Ethical leadership: An overview and future perspectives. Journal of Personnel Psychology, 11(1), 1-6.

Thomas, K. W., & Velthouse, B. A. (1990). Cognitive elements of empowerment: An “interpretive” model of intrinsic task motivation. Academy of Management Review, 15(4), 666-681.

Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy: The exercise of control. New York: Freeman.

Brown, M. E., & Treviño, L. K. (2006). Ethical leadership: A review and future directions. The Leadership Quarterly, 17(6), 595-616.

Brown, M. E., Treviño, L. K., & Harrison, D. A. (2005). Ethical leadership: A social learning perspective for construct development and testing. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 97(2), 117-134.

Dirks, K. T., & Ferrin, D. L. (2002). Trust in leadership: Meta-analytic findings and implications for research and practice. Journal of Applied Psychology, 87(4), 611-628.

Kalshoven, K., Den Hartog, D. N., & De Hoogh, A. H. B. (2011). Ethical leadership at work questionnaire (ELW): Development and validation of a multidimensional measure. The Leadership Quarterly, 22(1), 51-69.

Mayer, D. M., Kuenzi, M., Greenbaum, R. L., Bardes, M., & Salvador, R. B. (2009). How low does ethical leadership flow? Test of a trickle-down model. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 108(1), 1-13.

McAllister, D. J. (1995). Affect- and cognition-based trust as foundations for interpersonal cooperation in organizations. Academy of Management Journal, 38(1), 24-59.

Spreitzer, G. M. (1995). Psychological empowerment in the workplace: Dimensions, measurement, and validation. Academy of Management Journal, 38(5), 1442-1465.

Thomas, K. W., & Velthouse, B. A. (1990). Cognitive elements of empowerment: An “interpretive” model of intrinsic task motivation. Academy of Management Review, 15(4), 666-681.

Brown, M. E., & Treviño, L. K. (2006). Ethical leadership: A review and future directions. The Leadership Quarterly, 17(6), 595-616.

Kalshoven, K., Den Hartog, D. N., & De Hoogh, A. H. B. (2011). Ethical leadership at work questionnaire (ELW): Development and validation of a multidimensional measure. The Leadership Quarterly, 22(1), 51-69.

McAllister, D. J. (1995). Affect- and cognition-based trust as foundations for interpersonal cooperation in organizations. Academy of Management Journal, 38(1), 24-59.

Spreitzer, G. M. (1995). Psychological empowerment in the workplace: Dimensions, measurement, and validation. Academy of Management Journal, 38(5), 1442-1465.

Stubb, J., Pyhältö, K., & Lonka, K. (2011). Balancing between inspiration and exhaustion: PhD students’ experienced socio-psychological well-being. Studies in Continuing Education, 33(1), 33-50.

Thomas, K. W., & Velthouse, B. A. (1990). Cognitive elements of empowerment: An “interpretive” model of intrinsic task motivation. Academy of Management Review, 15(4), 666-681.

Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy: The exercise of control. New York: Freeman.

Brown, M. E., & Treviño, L. K. (2006). Ethical leadership: A review and future directions. The Leadership Quarterly, 17(6), 595-616.

Brown, M. E., Treviño, L. K., & Harrison, D. A. (2005). Ethical leadership: A social learning perspective for construct development and testing. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 97(2), 117-134.

Dirks, K. T., & Ferrin, D. L. (2002). Trust in leadership: Meta-analytic findings and implications for research and practice. Journal of Applied Psychology, 87(4), 611-628.

Kalshoven, K., Den Hartog, D. N., & De Hoogh, A. H. B. (2011). Ethical leadership at work questionnaire (ELW): Development and validation of a multidimensional measure. The Leadership Quarterly, 22(1), 51-69.

Mayer, D. M., Aquino, K., Greenbaum, R. L., & Kuenzi

Avolio, B. J., Walumbwa, F. O., & Weber, T. J. (2009). Leadership: Current theories, research, and future directions. In S. Zedeck (Ed.), APA handbook of industrial and organizational psychology, Vol. 1: Building and developing the organization (pp. 423-469). American Psychological Association.

Bandura, A. (1997). Self-efficacy: The exercise of control. New York: Freeman.

Brown, M. E., & Treviño, L. K. (2006). Ethical leadership: A review and future directions. The Leadership Quarterly, 17(6), 595-616.

Brown, M. E., Treviño, L. K., & Harrison, D. A. (2005). Ethical leadership: A social learning perspective for construct development and testing. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 97(2), 117-134.

Dirks, K. T., & Ferrin, D. L. (2002). Trust in leadership: Meta-analytic findings and implications for research and practice. Journal of Applied Psychology, 87(4), 611-628.

Kalshoven, K., Den Hartog, D. N., & De Hoogh, A. H. B. (2011). Ethical leadership at work questionnaire (ELW): Development and validation of a multidimensional measure. The Leadership Quarterly, 22(1), 51-69.

Mayer, D. M., Kuenzi, M., Greenbaum, R. L., Bardes, M., & Salvador, R. B. (2009). How low does ethical leadership flow? Test of a trickle-down model. Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes, 108(1), 1-13.

McAllister, D. J. (1995). Affect- and cognition-based trust as foundations for interpersonal cooperation in organizations. Academy of Management Journal, 38(1), 24-59.

Spreitzer, G. M. (1995). Psychological empowerment in the workplace: Dimensions, measurement, and validation. Academy of Management Journal, 38(5), 1442-1465.

Stubb, J., Pyhältö, K., & Lonka, K. (2011). Balancing between inspiration and exhaustion: PhD students' experienced socio-psychological well-being. Studies in Continuing Education, 33(1), 33-50.

Thomas, K. W., & Velthouse, B. A. (1990). Cognitive elements of empowerment: An "interpretive" model of intrinsic task motivation. Academy of Management Review, 15(4), 666-681.