

The Role of Employee Moral Awareness in Promoting Ethical Leadership: Towards Reducing Organisational Deviance in Ghana

Rosemary Boateng Coffie,  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4090-128X>

PhD, Senior Lecturer, Department of Human Resource and Organisational Development, School of Business, Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Ghana

Martin Owusu Ansah,  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5005-5670>

PhD, Lecturer, Department of Marketing and Corporate Strategy, School of Business, Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Ghana

Florence Ellis,  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4349-2733>

PhD, Senior Lecturer, Department of Human Resource and Organisational Development, School of Business, Kwame Nkrumah University of Science and Technology, Ghana

Corresponding author: Rosemary Boateng Coffie, framaygh@yahoo.co.uk

Type of manuscript: research paper

Abstract: *A leader's influence on subordinate behaviour may not always be direct as indicated by some researchers. Ethical leadership's influence may be dependent on other boundary factors. Employees' attentiveness to moral issues varies depending on how they cognitively process moral signals. This difference in employee moral awareness influences how an individual persistently recognizes and perceives morality and moral elements and subsequently practices its requirements. The study gap revolves around how employee moral awareness relates to ethical leadership and organisational deviance in the Ghanaian context. One key objective was to determine whether employee moral awareness moderates the nexus between organisational deviance and ethical leadership since the body of research on EL has largely relied on a leader-focused approach without regard to how subordinates' characteristics form boundary conditions to shape EL influence. The study also investigated the relationship between ethical leadership and organisational deviance. The study targeted 12 tier-1 banks operating as universal banks in Ghana and used a quantitative approach to sample and collect data from respondents associated with these banks. In analyzing the data, structural equation modelling, as well as descriptive statistics, were used. Results from the study report a significant negative relationship between ethical leadership and organisational deviance. Subordinate moral awareness also had an important moderating function in the association between organisational deviance and ethical leadership. Moral awareness training is recommended to be incorporated into organisational human resource training programs.*

Keywords: organisational deviance, ethical leadership, moral awareness, subordinate behaviour, leadership behaviour.

JEL Classification: M10, M12, M19.

Received: 06 February 2023

Accepted: 01 March 2023

Published: 31 March 2023

Funding: There is no funding for this research.

Publisher: Academic Research and Publishing UG (i.G.) (Germany)

Founder: Sumy State University and Academic Research and Publishing UG (i.G.) (Germany)

Cite as: Coffie, R.B., Ansah, M.O., & Ellis, F. (2023). The Role of Employee Moral Awareness in Promoting Ethical Leadership: Towards Reducing Organisational Deviance in Ghana. *Business Ethics and Leadership*, 7(1), 82-95. [http://doi.org/10.21272/bel.7\(1\).82-95.2023](http://doi.org/10.21272/bel.7(1).82-95.2023).



The Role of Employee Moral Awareness in Promoting Ethical Leadership: Towards Reducing Organisational Deviance in Ghana

1. Introduction

The prevalence of ethical breaches in the business world has led scholars to search for ways to promote workers' moral uprightness in the workplace, especially in light of high-profile cases such as Enron and WorldCom in 2001, Parmalat in 2003, and Lehman Brothers in 2008 (Farooqi et al., 2017). While past research has attributed these breaches to a lack of proper laws and regulatory measures, the persistent occurrence of such incidents worldwide suggests that these alone may not prevent recurrences (Gils et al., 2015). In Ghana, the banking sector has been plagued by similar operational breaches and regulatory non-compliance, linked to gross negligence and unseemliness with organisational leadership (Wolf, 2017). This study highlights the critical importance of moral awareness and how it moderates the relationship between ethical leadership and organisational deviance. Notably, leadership's behaviour and moral expectations serve as a model for employees (Schwepker & Dimitriou, 2021), making it challenging for them to display ethical conduct amid leadership impropriety.

The connection between ethical leadership (EL) and organisational deviance is often associated with the social learning theory, which posits that employees observe the actions of their leaders and learn from the consequences that follow (Schwarz et al., 2020). Leaders, as the most visible agents in the organisation, serve as reference points for employees, particularly those lower in the organisational hierarchy (Mayer et al., 2010; Schaubroeck et al., 2012). Thus, employees learn from their leaders' values and norms, which they reciprocate in their routine dealings at the organisation (Avolio et al., 2004.; Sims & Brinkmann, 2002). Schwarz et al. (2020) posit that a negative relationship exists between ethical leadership and employee deviance, asserting that when employees perceive their leaders as possessing ethical and trustworthy attributes, the likelihood of them engaging in deviant behaviours is mitigated.

Despite the long-standing association between EL and deviant behaviour, recent theoretical perspectives suggest that contextual factors such as employee moral awareness, organisational identity, and personality traits may contribute to organisational deviance (Gok et al., 2017). Penney et al. (2011) also argue that an employee's workplace behaviour reflects their self-identity or self-awareness, which can significantly influence how they respond to the demands and expectations of an ethical leader. Therefore, leaders must demonstrate ethical behaviour and cultivate a culture of compliance and accountability in all aspects of organisational operations. Hence the questions that need answers are: how does EL influence organisational deviance? And how does employee moral awareness moderate the relationship between EL and organisational deviance.

A dearth of research examining the extent to which an employee's moral awareness impacts their response to ethical leadership (EL) and how this could potentially mitigate organisational deviance (Chen & Hou, 2016) have been conducted. While prior studies have scrutinized the correlation between employee moral awareness and ethical leadership in healthcare (Amoah et al., 2022), micro-financial institutions (Addai et al., 2019), and education sectors (Ampomah, 2021), limited research has been conducted in the banking industry. Consequently, this research seeks to address this gap by providing a theoretical and conceptual explication of how an employee's moral awareness can affect their response to EL, ultimately reducing organisational deviance in this sector using 12 tier 1 banks in Ghana.

This study holds significant implications on several fronts. Firstly, it indicates that promoting ethical leadership in Ghana's banking sector necessitates a comprehensive approach, entailing the development of a culture of ethics and integrity within organisational leadership and implementing of effective regulatory frameworks that enforce accountability for ethical violations. Secondly, it presents a framework for future research on the correlation between ethical leadership and employee deviance across other industries and contexts. Finally, it offers practical insights for managers and leaders in Ghana's banking sector on fostering ethical leadership and diminishing employee deviance. In sum, this paper underscores the crucial role of ethical leadership in curbing employee deviance within Ghana's banking sector and highlights the importance of promoting ethical behaviour at all levels of organisational operations.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Ethical Leadership. The exposition of prescriptively appropriate behaviour through personal relations and decisions and the promotion of such behaviour to workers through dyadic contact, encouragement, and decision-making is characterized as EL (Brown & Mitchell, 2010). Generally, ethical leaders get legitimized by demonstrating prescriptively appropriate behaviours like trustworthiness, impartiality, and care. Secondly, ethical leaders value ethics and also frequently take real steps to make ethics visible in their external interactions, such as sharing ethical information with their subordinates, allowing subordinates to express their viewpoints (Bass et al., 1999), establishing ethical guidelines, and encouraging ethical behaviour via rewards (Treviño et al., 2003).

Ethical leaders incorporate ethics when assessing the repercussions of their activities and making responsible decisions worthy of emulation (Bass et al., 1999). Generally, ethical leaders impact their workforce in various ways. For instance, ethical leaders are accountable for the morals of ethics in their organisation, either by serving as role models for ethical behaviour or by reinforcing ethical norms throughout the organisation (Mayer et al., 2010). For example, ethical leaders, through their standards, can increase a subordinate's organisational identification (Knippenberg et al., 2004), which in effect induces followers to work towards the collective goals of the organisation or exhibit positive behaviour (Avey et al., 2011). This suggests that the followers' ethical behaviour in a variety of ways is influenced by ethical leaders. For instance, the influence of EL on-employee outcomes was significant in areas of organisational citizenship behaviour (Wang & Sung, 2016), discretionary effort (Kalshoven et al., 2012), organisation's ethical climate (Schaubroeck et al., 2012) and organisational misconduct (Mayer et al., 2010). Moreover, the concept of EL happens to be distinctively different from other subordinates-based leadership styles that are made up of both moral and unethical aspects, vis-à-vis transformational leadership (van Knippenberg & Sitkin, 2013) and servant leadership (Liden et al., 2008). The primary discrepancy is that EL is fashioned by moral reasoning, independent of the perceiver's mental propositioning (Gils et al., 2015). It means that leaders with high scores on EL possess specific moral behavioural personalities such as high social responsibility and moral identity (Mayer et al., 2010).

2.2 Organisational Deviance. In the literature, different concepts have been used to represent the concept of organisational deviance. For instance, such concepts as counterproductive behaviour, antisocial behaviour, workplace rudeness, organisational misconduct, and employee deviance have been used in different settings to depict the concept (Cortina, 2008). Even though different terminologies have been used to represent organisational deviance, their descriptions or definitions tend to suggest the same meaning (Novalien, 2017). For instance, Spector and Fox (2005) described organisational deviance as behaviours that are consciously meant to hurt an organisation or its employees. This description is consistent with the categorization provided by Zribi et al. (2013) on DB. According to Zribi et al. (2013), organisational deviance systematically adversely affects the organisation's performance. It suggests that individuals may intentionally decide to distort the working arrangement of an organisation or that of their colleagues to minimize the organisation's effectiveness. According to Zribi et al. (2013), organisational deviance could take the form of direct (sabotage) or indirect behaviour (i.e., verbal, physical, moral abuses, and sexual disorders). Robinson and Bennett (1997), on their part, described organisational deviance as the behaviour deliberately done to counteract organisational norms and affects the organisation and its members negatively. Generally, these behaviours can include abuse, production deviance, sabotage, thievery, employee disengagement, aggression, vengeance, and revenge (Spector et al., 2006).

According to Robinson and Bennett (1997), organisational deviance can be categorized into organisational DB and individual DB. Specifically, organisational behaviour takes the form of property and production DB, whereas individual DB takes the form of political deviance and personal aggression (Mikulay et al., 2001). Robinson and Bennett (1997) again added that organisational deviance categorically takes two dimensions: severity and target. Severity in this context constitutes the extent to which the DB disrupts important institutional values and may again appear to have a damaging effect on the organisation as well as the people in the organisation. For instance, the severity could be theft, sexual or physical abuse, excessive absenteeism, etc. However, when it comes to the target, it relates to the direction with which the deviant acts seek to target, for instance, whether the deviant action will be directed toward the organisation or individuals. As indicated earlier organisational deviance will be property destruction, production deviation, or theft. Conversely, personal deviants will take the form of social loafing, gossip, abuse, etc. (Mikulay et al., 2001).

2.3 Moral Awareness. Employee moral awareness refers to an individual's perception and understanding of ethical issues and values in the workplace (Aquino & Reed, 2002). It is an essential aspect of ethical behaviour, as it influences an individual's decision-making and behaviour in the workplace (Schiemann & Dubinsky, 2006). Many academics have explored the influence of employee moral awareness on various aspects of organisational behaviour. One of the key findings of research on employee moral awareness is that it is a crucial factor in shaping organisational deviance (Krambia-Kapardis, 2016). Employees with high levels of moral awareness are unlikely to engage in DB and more likely to act ethically (Aquino & Reed, 2002). Conversely, employees with low levels of moral awareness are prone to engage in unethical behaviour and unlikely to act ethically (Schiemann & Dubinsky, 2006). Research has also shown that employee moral awareness is shaped by various factors, including personal values, cultural background, and socialization experiences (Aquino & Reed, 2002). For example, individuals from cultures that strongly emphasize honesty and integrity are more likely to have high levels of moral awareness (Schiemann & Dubinsky, 2006). In addition, individuals who have had positive experiences with ethical decision-making are more likely to develop high levels of moral awareness (Krambia-Kapardis, 2016). Moreover, research depicts that employee moral awareness can be impacted by the organisational culture and climate (Aquino & Reed, 2002). Organisations with a strong ethical culture and climate are more likely to foster high levels of moral awareness among their employees (Schiemann & Dubinsky, 2006). Conversely, organisations with weak ethical cultures are more likely to have employees with low levels of moral awareness (Krambia-Kapardis, 2016). In many organisations, a code of conduct sets clear expectations for ethical behaviour and provides employees with guidance on how to act ethically (Krambia-Kapardis, 2016).

2.4 Relationship Between EL and Organisational Deviance. Gils et al. (2015) claim that moral leaders affect their subordinates differently. For instance, moral leaders advocate for upholding ethical standards inside their organisations by serving as an example of ethical conduct or enforcing standards through reward and punishment schemes (Brown et al., 2006; Mayer et al., 2012; Avey et al., 2011). Once more, employees mimic their superiors' behaviour, which renders employees' actions dependent on the effectiveness of leader-member interactions (Brown et al., 2006; Avey et al., 2011). Thirdly, moral leaders encourage institutional identification among their followers (Hoch et al., 2018), motivating followers to achieve organisational objectives or engage in pro-organisational behaviour (Avey et al., 2011). It shows that managers who practice moral leadership are more likely to persuade their staff members to imitate or copy them at work.

For instance, it was found in the work of Gill et al. (2015) that EL is negatively linked to organisational deviance at work. Particularly, in their study, it was observed that leaders high on EL could dissuade organisational deviance and encourage subordinates to work for the general good of society and everyone in the organisation. Similarly, the studies of Avey et al. (2011) and Erkutlu et al. (2014) revealed that an increase in EL at the workplace had a significant inverse relationship with subordinate DB. According to Mayer et al. (2012), when leaders promote moral and ethical behaviour at work, their subordinates see these principles daily through their exchanges with their leaders. As such, they are more likely to replicate the same principles and organisational norms in their work roles and behaviour.

Likewise, in the study of Aryati et al. (2018), it has been proven that EL can help an organisation foster a more moral culture, which reduces the likelihood of workplace misconduct. As a result, Aryati et al. (2018) concluded that EL has two different effects, either espousing a direct or indirect effect on DB in the workplace. According to Aryati et al. (2018), the indirect effect of EL will sharpen the perception of ethical climate, which in turn minimizes DB at the workplace. Adnan and Shams' (2018) study investigated how EL affects organisational cronyism through ethical culture. The research again looked at the role of leader-member exchanges on ethical culture.

The study collected data from 306 workers within the private sector. Results from the research showed that EL significantly affects organisational cronyism. Again, it was established that leader-member exchanges moderated the association between ethical culture and organisational cronyism. Gill et al. (2016) discovered a significant negative association between employee engagement in DB and EL in their meta-analysis. Specifically, Gill et al. (2016) observed that EL discouraged employees from engaging in deviant acts that can negatively affect the organisation and that of the employees within the organisation. The findings also showed a strong correlation between EL and employee participation in corporate social responsibility. In their study, Avey et al. (2011) found a significant and consistent negative correlation between EL and employee participation in criminal behaviour.

However, it is not in all cases that a noteworthy association has been established between EL and organisational deviance. For instance, EL was found to have a negligible link with employee DB in the study by Detert et al. (2008). Similarly, in the study of Goodenough (2008), an insignificant connection was reported between EL and organisational DB. According to Walumbwa et al. (2011), the ethical climate in the organisation may be somehow responsible for the potentially inconsequential link between EL and DB. For instance, it is challenging for leader-subordinate exchanges to produce favourable behavioural effects when the ethical atmosphere in an organisation does not detest organisational deviance. Accordingly, Elçi et al. (2013) argued that the effect of EL on DB may induce an ethical climate created and supported in the firm. Based on the discussions, we hypothesize that:

H1: EL has a significant and positive relationship with organisational deviance.

2.5 Moderating Effect of Moral Awareness on Organisational Deviance and EL. According to Penney et al. (2011), an employee's workplace behaviour often tends to reflect their self-awareness. Generally, employees with high moral awareness tend to be well informed on the ethical issues at play and always seek to situate their decision within the proper ethical context (Mai et al., 2019). However, the contrary holds for persons with low moral awareness. Because different employees pay different amounts of attention to moral concerns (Reynolds, 2008), it suggests that a person's moral awareness may influence a person's engagement or disengagement in DB since their level of moral awareness shapes their self-identity as well as their perception on what is right and wrong (Spector et al., 2006). This argument contends that the immediate effects of EL may not always produce favourable results as their effect may be dependent on certain situational factors (Chuang et al., 2016). As a result, superiors might expect more from subordinates with high moral awareness because these individuals are more likely to identify EL and respond to it more strongly (Gils et al., 2015).

Gok's et al. (2017) study investigated the common influences of moral leadership, moral vigilance, and moral awareness on workplace misbehaviour. Gok et al. (2017) investigated how disparities in moral perspectives impact people's propensity to react to unethical leadership behaviours by acting differently toward their employer or superior. The study's findings indicate that followers' reactions to perceived unethical leader behaviour may vary depending on each person's level of moral attention and awareness. Results from the studies of Eisenbeiss et al. (2015) and Hannah et al. (2014) revealed that people with strong moral awareness responded to EL influence more favourably than people with low moral awareness, exhibiting more helpful and prosocial work behaviours in their work units. Greenbaum et al. (2013) observed that subordinates with high moral characteristics responded to a leader's unethical behaviours more strongly than persons with low moral characteristics.

Notwithstanding the realisation that boundary factors influence EL's impact on organisational DB, there have been limited studies, particularly in the Ghanaian context, regarding how employee moral identities vis-à-vis moral awareness and attentiveness influence EL's impact on subordinate DB. As rightly indicated by Neves and Story (2015), since boundary conditions may either improve or restrict EL impact, particularly in leader-member exchanges, it becomes important to look at the moderating role these boundary factors have on EL influence on subordinates' behaviour. Examining the influence of these boundary factors will not only improve the effectiveness of EL but may also help us in having a better understanding with regards to when and why reciprocal responses are more or less effective in a leader-subordinate exchange Neves & Story (2015).

H2: Employee moral awareness moderates the relationship between ethical leadership and organisational deviance.

2.6 Theoretical Review

2.6.1 Social Identity Theory. According to the social identity theory argument, individuals identify themselves in social terms. Their contact and affiliation partly influence individual self-definition with a particular social group (Tajfel, 1974). However, a moral identity that originates from personal identification (i.e., personal values) and institutional identification may shape a person's identity formation and workplace behaviours (He et al., 2013). For instance, Aquino et al. (1968) assert that moral identity, which depicts a person's self-image, influences a person's moral traits, self-belief, attitudes, and behaviours. Moral identity, according to Aquino et al. (1968), can be divided into two types: symbolisation which is a public identity i.e., the extent to which ethical attributes are shown in an individual's deeds in the world and internalisation, which is the isolated self and reflects the degree to which moral qualities are central to a person's sense of

self. Often, the internalisation dimension of moral identity has been found to induce more influence on a person's attitudes and behaviours because it mimics an individual's self-identity more than the symbolisation, which signals a person's outer perspective (Mayer et al., 2010). Generally, it has been established that moral identity has a significant positive effect on employee behaviours such as volunteerism (Winterich et al., 2013), donations, environmental sustainability, and whistleblowing while being inversely related to aggression and organisational deviance (Hardy et al., 2014; Hardy et al., 2015). It is believed that a person with a strong sense of moral identity will be highly motivated to act per their moral views independent of organisational forces since moral identity is character-based, per O'Keefe et al. (2019). According to the authors, respondents with high moral identification scores and believed that their leaders exhibited great EL were less likely to act immorally. According to Aquino et al. (2009), situational elements like a person's moral identity or attention will interact with EL to promote beneficial workplace behaviour.

2.6.2 Social Learning Theory. This theory emphasizes the causes and effects of EL and contends that employees might learn the standards of appropriate behaviour in two ways: through their personal experience or the observations of those in positions of authority (Bandura, 1986). Employees observe and emulate reliable and appealing role models as they acquire these norms (Brown et al., 2005). However, ethical leaders can only become exemplary, credible, and appealing if they demonstrate honesty and strong morals (Brown et al., 2005). Again, through ethical leaders' regular two-way communication with their subordinates, they can discuss the ethical standards and norms upheld by themselves and that of the organisation at large (Peng & Kim, 2020). This ongoing connection between the superior and subordinate aids the subordinates in adopting these standards and norms and instilling them in their daily interactions.

In reciprocation, subordinates who regularly report to a superior leader gradually appreciate the common ethics and standards upheld by the leader and the organisation. However, it has been observed that followers are more likely to learn and replicate the organisational norms in two ways; either through a direct experience with their leader or through remote learning when the leader is seen to be adhering to the same principles and standards in their day-to-day activities (Brown et al., 2005). Accordingly, after seeing and observing their superiors adhering to these ethical norms and principles, followers are more inclined to imitate and internalise their leaders' behaviours centred on value (Brown et al., 2005). According to the social learning theory, ethical behaviour is encouraged by role models through informational and motivational methods (Bandura, 1977). That is, superiors serving as role models stimulate ethical behaviour by modelling the behaviours they would like to encourage and reward and punish for behaviours they want to abolish. Ethical leaders can prudently control their follower's behaviours by punishing normatively unfitting behaviours (e.g., over-promising to win clients' hearts) and rewarding desirable behaviours (e.g., assisting clients in filling a form or filling a complaint) (Schaubroeck et al., 2012).

3. Methodology

A survey research design was employed in this investigation. A survey design was chosen above the other research approaches since the study aimed to evaluate the moderating influence of moral awareness on organisational deviance and EL. The study used 50% (i.e., 12 of the Tier-1) of the banks as the institutional population to make the study results representative of the entire banking sector. Regarding the number of employees within these 12 banks, a recent banking sector survey by PricewaterhouseCoopers (PwC) suggests that the universal banks' total number of employees stands at 7,000, with 4,000 as permanent employees and the remaining 3,000 as contract workers (PwC, 2019). However, at the individual bank level, a bank is estimated to have a staff strength of 500. Hence, 6000 employees were targeted from these 12 selected Tier-1 banks.

As this study dealt with individual employees within the 12 selected Tier-1 banks, stratified random sampling was preferred over the other sampling techniques. According to Bryman (2012), the stratified random sampling technique becomes the most useful; especially when a study seeks to ensure that all the different units within a population are fairly represented in the study's sample selection. With each bank having an estimated employee size of 500, the sample size for each participating bank was determined using the Krejcie and Morgan (1970) sampling formula. According to the author's table, a population size of 500 corresponds with a sample size of 217. Accordingly, 217 employees were randomly picked from the 12 participating banks. Two thousand six hundred and four employees (2604) were randomly selected from the 12 banks. Hence a total of two thousand six hundred and four (2604) questionnaires were distributed to employees across the twelve (12) tier-1 banks in Ghana. From the questionnaires distributed, one thousand

one hundred and seventy-two (1172) were retrieved. Nevertheless, out of the 1172 received questionnaires, hundred and ninety-two (192) were unusable because the questionnaires were not fully completed. This implies that 980 questionnaires were considered for the study analysis, yielding an appropriate valid response rate of 84%.

3.1 Variables and Measures. Except for the demographic profile, the measuring scales for all the other variables (i.e., EL, organisational deviance, and moral awareness) were derived from the current scales. Each item was evaluated using a five-point Likert scale (1 = Completely Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Agree and 5 = Completely Agree). The EL scale, derived from Brown et al., (2005), was used in this study to evaluate EL from the viewpoints of both higher- and lower-level employees within the targeted banks. The scale had ten items in all and had questions on issues such as, 'my organisation's leader listens to what employees have to say, my organisation's leader penalizes employees who violate ethical norms, my organisation's leader lives a personal ethical life, and my organisation's leader keeps the best interests of employees in mind', etc. With organisational deviance scale, it was adapted from Bennett and Robinson (2000). The scale had ten items in all and had questions on issues such as, "I worked on a personal matter rather than for my organisation; I took property from work without permission; I spent too much time fantasising or daydreaming rather than working; I made fun of someone at work; and I falsified a receipt to be reimbursed for more money than I spent on business expenses", etc. Finally, Arnaud (2010) 's scale was used to assess moral awareness. It consisted of 3 items (e.g., "I am aware of ethical issues in this organisation").

4. Data Analysis

Descriptive statistics were first computed to characterise and summarise the study data. Following that, structural equation modelling (SEM) was utilised to investigate the link between the study variables, i.e., EL, organisational deviance, and moral awareness.

4.1 Reliability and Validity Assessments. To ensure that the scales were measuring the same underlying construct, a confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) was used to determine the unidimensionality of all the measuring scales (EL, organisational deviance, and moral awareness). The CFA results perfectly match practically all the goodness of fit metrics. For instance, the EL measuring scale received a best fit of χ^2 (972, N=980) = 1289.257 $p < 0.001$. Comparative Fit Index (CFI) = 0.921; Tucker-Lewis Index (TLI) = 0.871; Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) = 0.067; Standardised Root Mean Squared (SRMR) = 0.053; Confidence Interval (CI), 0.171-0.178). Also, organisational deviance received a best fit of χ^2 (970, N=980) = 1317.282 $p < 0.001$; CFI = 0.941; TLI = 0.893; RMSEA = 0.059; SRMR = 0.048 (CI, 0.169-0.188). Lastly, moral awareness measuring scale received best fit of χ^2 (972, N=980) = 1277.241 $p < 0.001$; CFI = 0.927; TLI = 0.931; RMSEA = 0.061; SRMR = 0.055 (CI, 0.172-0.184). Results obtained on the goodness of fit indicators indicate that all the scales measured one underlying construct (Hair et al., 2017). Guided by the suggestions given by Hair et al. (2017), it can be stated that the values recorded on CFI, TLI, RMSEA, and SRMR indicate that the fitted model is within the acceptable and threshold level. It also confirmed that there was a construct and discriminant validity of the various scales used to measure EL, organisational deviance, and moral awareness. This is presented in Table 1 below.

Table 1. Confirmatory Factor Analysis

Variables	Chi-square (χ^2)	RMSEA	SRMR	CFI	TLI
EL	1289.257	0.067	0.053	0.921	0.871
OD	1317.282	0.059	0.048	0.941	0.893
MA	1277.241	0.061	0.055	0.927	0.931
Overall fit	3883.78	0.187	0.156	2.789	2.695

NB: EL: Ethical Leadership, OD: Organisational Deviance, MA: Moral Awareness

Source: Compiled by the authors

However, to measure convergent validity, factor loadings and average variance extracted (AVE) were used to gauge the variations shown by each construct about the differences drawn from measurement error. According to Awang (2018), AVE within the range of 0.50 or more confirms convergent validity. Similarly, results in Table 2 below indicate that all the scales' AVE values were above 0.80, signifying a high level of convergent validity. As Hair et al. (2017) suggested, when a construct reliability score receives a value of 0.7 or more, the scale can be deemed highly reliable. Similarly, in this study, all the scales received a Cronbach alpha value of 0.7 or more, confirming that all the constructs were highly reliable.

Table 2. Details of Measures and Results of Validity Tests

Constructs	Alpha	CR	AVE	T-values	Factor Loading
Ethical Leadership	0.941	0.891	0.801		
EL 1				13.49	0.722
EL 2				13.57	0.770
EL 3				13.92	0.767
EL 3				13.71	0.925
EL 4				13.31	0.741
EL 5				10.44	0.770
EL 6				13.25	0.773
EL 7				13.90	0.713
EL 8				13.90	0.861
EL 9				13.25	0.878
EL 10				11.24	0.871
Organisational deviance	0.873	0.912	0.861		
OD 1				10.45	0.766
OD 2				11.02	0.620
OD 3				13.27	0.821
OD 4				13.36	0.870
OD 5				11.54	0.675
OD 6				13.47	0.785
OD 7				11.04	0.839
OD 8				10.95	0.642
OD 9				10.61	0.821
OD 10				13.56	0.778
Moral awareness	0.955	0.841	0.72		
MA 1				13.90	0.843
MA 2				11.12	0.709
MA 3				13.17	0.735
Chi-square (χ^2)		RMSEA	SRMR	CFI	TLI
EL	1289.257	0.067	0.053	0.921	0.871
OD	1317.282	0.059	0.048	0.941	0.893
MA	1277.241	0.061	0.055	0.927	0.931
Overall fit	3883.78	0.187	0.156	2.789	2.695

NB: EL: Ethical Leadership, OD: Organisational Deviance, MA: Moral Awareness

Source: Compiled by the authors

4.2 The Results of the Relationship Analysis. The results of the relationship analysis of the models have been presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Regression Results

Variable	Adjusted R2	ΔR^2	β_i	T
Model 1	0.238			
EL			-0.252***	-10.067
Model 2	0.236	0.536		
EL			-0.442***	-8.558
MA			-0.952***	-4.019
Moderator (EL*MA)			-1.453***	-14.501

a. Dependent Variable: Organisational deviance

* Depicts significance at 10% level; ** depicts significance at 5% level, *** depicts significance at 1% level and β_i stands for standardized beta coefficients

NB: EL: Ethical Leadership, MA: Moral Awareness

Source: Compiled by the authors

In model 1, according to the study's findings, EL has a significant relationship with organisational deviance. Specifically, EL explained 23.8% of the variance in organisational deviance, $\Delta R^2 = 0.238$, $F(2,978) = 101.346$, $p < .0001$. On the effect size of EL, it received a negative coefficient value suggesting that EL had a significant negative relationship with organisational deviance ($\beta = -0.252$, $t = -10.067$, $p < .0001$). The results can therefore be inferred that as EL increases, employee penchant to engage in organisational deviance decreases in the same direction.

Moreover, regarding the moderator's role in the association between employee organisational deviance and EL, it can be observed from Table 3 that the earlier R2 improved further from 0.236 to 0.536 by the difference of 0.3. Meaning the influence, EL had on organisational deviance became much better after the inclusion of moral awareness. Again, the p-value recorded on the moderator variable stood at $p < .0001$, confirming that subordinate moral awareness significantly influences the association between EL and organisational deviance. As a result, EL may significantly impact organisational deviance, particularly when the employee has a high level of moral awareness. Subordinates with high moral awareness are more likely to identify EL and, as a result, will work to their expectations than subordinates with poor moral awareness.

5. Discussions

As indicated earlier, EL decreases subordinates' penchant to engage in organisational deviance. Through ethical leaders' regular two-way communication with their subordinates, they can discuss the ethical standards and norms upheld by themselves and that of the organisation (Peng & Kim, 2020). The consequence of this continuous interaction is that it helps followers embrace these standards and norms and inculcate the same in their daily dealings. Accordingly, subordinates who frequently see and observe their superiors' strict adherence to ethical norms and principles are more likely to imitate and internalise the value-driven behaviours of their leaders in their daily dealings (Brown et al., 2005).

According to the study's findings, EL has a greater impact on subordinates' organisational deviance, especially when subordinates have high moral awareness. Since it mirrors a person's moral awareness, moral identity may significantly influence an individual's self-beliefs, dispositions, and conduct (Mayer et al., 2012). As a result, people with a high level of moral identity are more prone to be inspired to closely adhere to their moral ideas and ideals, regardless of organisational constraints that demand them to act otherwise (O'Keefe et al., 2019). Results from the study suggest that subordinates with high moral awareness will be more aware of the ethical issues at stake and will always seek to situate their decision within the proper ethical context (Mai et al., 2019). Accordingly, a person's moral awareness may influence their engagement or disengagement in DB since their level of moral awareness influences their identification and assessment of right and wrong (Spector, 2019). Therefore, the spontaneous impact of EL on-employee behaviour may be reliant on certain situational factors such as subordinate moral awareness and moral identity (Taylor et al., 2014; Chuang et al., 2016). For example, morally aware subordinates are more likely to recognise the new demands of the ethical leader. They will thus react more forcefully to comply with the leader's expectations (Gils et al., 2015).

Results from the research align with the views of Aquino et al. (2009) as they argued that situational factors such as a person's moral identity or attentiveness would interrelate with EL in promoting positive workplace behaviour. The study's findings are per Gok et al. (2017)'s conclusion, indicating that followers' responses to ethical leader job expectations depend on their level of moral awareness and moral attentiveness.

6. Implication of the Study

Notwithstanding the theoretical arguments surrounding EL and organisational deviance, most extant works have often taken a leader-focused approach without recourse to how subordinates' characteristics shape EL's influence on subordinate behaviour. Particularly, within the Ghanaian context, there is limited understanding of how employee moral awareness influences their recognition and perception of morality and moral elements in their daily dealings at the workplace. Results from the study have somehow improved our understanding regarding how EL's real impact may not always be direct but may depend on other situational factors such as moral awareness. For example, the study's findings revealed that EL has a more significant impact on subordinates' organisational deviance, especially when the subordinate has a high level of moral awareness. Some practical implications of the study are for policy formulation and implementation at organisational level regarding ethical leadership training which can influence productivity and efficiency in organisations at the micro level and if all organisations are doing same, it will affect the economy at the macro level.

7. Conclusions, Limitations, and Future Research

According to the study's findings, there is a significant negative association between employee organisational deviance and EL. It implies that as EL increases, employee penchant for perpetrating organisational deviance decreases in the same direction. Also, the study revealed that a subordinate's moral awareness had a significant moderation role in the link between EL and organisational deviance among

employees. It suggests that the impact of EL on subordinates' organisational deviance will be more substantial, especially when the subordinate scores high on moral awareness.

Finally, like other research, this one had some limitations. For instance, the study used a survey design. This design, per its architecture, constrained the study from making a more dependable causal inference between EL and organisational deviance. As deviance predicts future behaviour, using survey data to assess the respondent's DB and the perspective of the leader's ethical behaviour may result in unfair representation in the respondent's assessments. All these factors are likely to affect the validity of the study results. Accordingly, a longitudinal design should be used in future studies to augment the predictive power between EL and employee organisational deviance. Again, the data came from only employees within the Ghanaian banking sector. It suggests that results from the study cannot be generalised to other sectors within the Ghanaian economy. Future studies should incorporate samples from different sectors to see the effects and improve the study conclusions' generalizability. Lastly, this research looked at the moderating influence of moral awareness in the analysis. Accordingly, other studies should examine how personal characteristics such as age, job position, and gender moderate or mediate the connection between organisational deviance among employees and EL.

Author Contributions: Conceptualization: Rosemary Boateng Coffie; methodology: Rosemary Boateng Coffie & Martin Owusu Ansah; software: Martin Owusu Ansah; validation: Rosemary Boateng Coffie, Martin Owusu Ansah & Florence Ellis; formal analysis: Rosemary Boateng Coffie; investigation: Rosemary Boateng Coffie; resources: Rosemary Boateng Coffie; data curation: Martin Owusu Ansah; writing-original draft preparation: Rosemary Boateng Coffie; writing-review and editing: Florence Ellis; visualization: Rosemary Boateng Coffie; supervision: Rosemary Boateng Coffie; project administration: Rosemary Boateng Coffie.

Conflicts of Interest: Not applicable.

Data Availability Statement: Not applicable.

Informed Consent Statement: Not applicable.

List of Abbreviations

AVE	Average Variance Extracted
CEO	Chief Executive
CFA	Confirmatory Factor Analysis
CFI	Comparative Fit Index
CI	Confidence Interval
DB	Deviant Behaviour
EL	Ethical Leadership
MA	Moral Awareness
OD	Organisational Deviance
PwC	PricewaterhouseCoopers
RMSEA	Root Mean Square Error of Approximation
SEM	Structural Equation
SRMR	Standardised Root Mean Square Residual
TLI	Tucker-Lewis Index

References

1. Addai, P., Avor, J., Ofori, I.N., & Tweneboah, D.N. (2019). Ethical leadership and productive work attitudes among micro financial institutions in Ghana: Moderating role of organizational climate. *Management Research Review*, 42(9), 1049-1061. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
2. Amoah, C., Jehu-Appiah, J., Boateng, E.A., Amoah, C., Jehu-Appiah, J., & Boateng, E.A. (2022). Ethical Leadership, Job Satisfaction, and Organisational Commitment among Health Workers in Ghana: Evidence from Central Region Hospitals. *Journal of Human Resource and Sustainability Studies*, 10(1), 123-141. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
3. Ampomah, R. (2021). Ethical Leadership And Teacher Professional Values: Matters Arising From The Northern Region Of Ghana. *European Journal of Education Studies*, 8(7), 2021. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)

4. Arnaud, A. (2010). Conceptualizing and measuring ethical work climate: Development and validation of the ethical climate index. *Business & Society*, 49(2), 345-358. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
5. Aquino, K., & Reed II, A. (2002). The self-importance of moral identity. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 83(6), 1423. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
6. Aquino, K., Freeman, D., Reed II, A., Lim, V. K., & Felps, W. (2009). Testing a social-cognitive model of moral behavior: the interactive influence of situations and moral identity centrality. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 97(1), 123. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
7. Aryati, A.S., Sudiro, A., Hadiwidjaja, D., & Noermijati, N. (2018). The influence of ethical leadership to deviant workplace behavior mediated by ethical climate and organisational commitment. *International Journal of Law and Management*, 60(2), 233-249. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
8. Avey, J.B., Palanski, M.E., & Walumbwa, F.O. (2011). When Leadership Goes Unnoticed: The Moderating Role of Follower Self-Esteem on the Relationship Between Ethical Leadership and Follower Behavior. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 98(4), 573-582. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
9. Avolio, B.J., Gardner, W.L., Walumbwa, F.O., Luthans, F., & May, D.R. (2004). Unlocking the mask: A look at the process by which authentic leaders impact follower attitudes and behaviours. *The leadership quarterly*, 15(6), 801-823. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
10. Awang, P. (2018). Pendekatan Mudah SEM (Structural Equation Modeling). [\[CrossRef\]](#)
11. Bandura, A., & Walters, R.H. (1977). *Social learning theory* (Vol. 1). Prentice Hall: Englewood cliffs. [\[Google Scholar\]](#)
12. Bass, B.M., & Steidlmeier, P. (1999). Ethics, character, and authentic transformational leadership behavior. *The leadership quarterly*, 10(2), 181-217. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
13. Bennett, R.J., & Robinson, S.L. (2000). Development of a measure of workplace deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(3), 349-360. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
14. Brown, M.E., & Mitchell, M.S. (2010). Ethical and Unethical Leadership: Exploring New Avenues for Future Research. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 20(4), 583-616. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
15. Brown, M.E., & Treviño, L.K. (2006). Ethical leadership: A review and future directions. *The leadership quarterly*, 17(6), 595-616. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
16. Brown, M.E., Treviño, L.K., & Harrison, D.A. (2005). Ethical leadership: A social learning perspective for construct development and testing. *Organisational behavior and human decision processes*, 97(2), 117-134. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
17. Bryman, A. (2016). *Social research methods*. Oxford university press. [\[Google Scholar\]](#)
18. Chen, A.S.Y., & Hou, Y.H. (2016). The effects of ethical leadership, voice behavior and climates for innovation on creativity: A moderated mediation examination. *Leadership Quarterly*, 27(1), 1-13. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
19. Chuang, P.J., & Chiu, S.F. (2018). When moral personality and moral ideology meet ethical leadership: A three-way interaction model. *Ethics & Behavior*, 28(1), 45-69. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
20. Cortina, L.M. (2008). Unseen injustice: Incivility as modern discrimination in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, 33(1), 55-75. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
21. Detert, J.R., Treviño, L.K., & Sweitzer, V.L. (2008). Moral disengagement in ethical decision making: a study of antecedents and outcomes. *Journal of applied psychology*, 93(2), 374. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
22. Eisenbeiss, S.A., van Knippenberg, D., & Fahrbach, C.M. (2015). Doing Well by Doing Good? Analyzing the Relationship Between CEO Ethical Leadership and Firm Performance. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 128(3), 635-651. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
23. Elçi, M., Şener, I., & Alpan, L. (2013). The impacts of ethical leadership on the antisocial behavior of employees: the mediating role of ethical climate. *Journal of Global Strategic Management*, 14(1), 56-66. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
24. Epley, N., & Kumar, A. (2019). Putting Ethical Design into Practice. *Harvard Business Review*, 97(3), 144-150. [\[Google Scholar\]](#)
25. Erkutlu, H., & Chafra, J. (2014). Ethical leadership and workplace bullying in higher education. *Hacettepe University Journal of Education*, 29(3), 55-67. [\[Google Scholar\]](#)
26. Farooqi, S., Abid, G., & Ahmed, A. (2017). How bad it is to be good: Impact of organisational ethical culture on whistleblowing (the ethical partners). *Arab Economic and Business Journal*, 12(2), 69-80. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)

27. Ferris, D.L., Brown, D.J., & Heller, D. (2009). Organisational supports and organisational deviance: The mediating role of organization-based self-esteem. *Organisational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 108(2), 279-286. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
28. Gill, S.S., Haider, S., & Noreen, S. (2016). Linking ethical leadership with organisational deviance and CSR: Empirical review. *Asian Journal of Multidisciplinary Studies*, 4(6), 23-28. [\[Google Scholar\]](#)
29. Gok, K., Demirtas, O., & Arslan, A. (2017). The moderating effects of moral awareness and moral attentiveness on the relationship between ethical leadership and workplace deviance. In *28th EBEN Conference* (pp. 1-26). [\[Google Scholar\]](#)
30. Goodenough, P. (2008). Ethical leadership, values congruence, and workplace deviance: An exploratory study. [\[Google Scholar\]](#)
31. Greenbaum, R.L., Bardes Mawritz, M., Mayer, D.M., & Priesemuth, M. (2013). To act out, to withdraw, or to constructively resist? Employee reactions to supervisor abuse of customers and the moderating role of employee moral identity. *Journals. Sagepub.Com*, 66(7), 925-950. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
32. Grill, M., Nielsen, K., Grytnes, R., Pousette, A., & Törner, M. (2018). The leadership practices of construction site managers and their influence on occupational safety: an observational study of transformational and passive/avoidant. *Taylor & Francis*, 37(5), 278-293. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
33. Hair, J., Tomas, G., Hult, M., Ringle, C.M., Sarstedt, M., Hair, J.F., & Thiele, K.O. (2017). Mirror, mirror on the wall: a comparative evaluation of composite-based structural equation modelling methods. *Springer*, 45(5), 616-632. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
34. Hannah, S.T., Jennings, P.L., Bluhm, D., Peng, A.C., & Schaubroeck, J.M. (2014). Duty orientation: Theoretical development and preliminary construct testing. *Organisational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 123(2), 220-238. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
35. Hardy, S.A., Bean, D.S., & Olsen, J.A. (2015). Moral identity and adolescent prosocial and antisocial behaviours: Interactions with moral disengagement and self-regulation. *Journal of youth and adolescence*, 44, 1542-1554. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
36. Hardy, S.A., Walker, L.J., Olsen, J.A., Woodbury, R.D., & Hickman, J.R. (2014). Moral identity as moral ideal self: links to adolescent outcomes. *Developmental psychology*, 50(1), 45. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
37. He, H., & Brown, A.D. (2013). Organisational identity and organisational identification: A review of the literature and suggestions for future research. *Group & Organization Management*, 38(1), 3-35. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
38. Hoch, J. E., Bommer, W. H., Dulebohn, J. H., & Wu, D. (2018). Do ethical, authentic, and servant leadership explain variance above and beyond transformational leadership? A meta-analysis. *Journal of management*, 44(2), 501-529. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
39. Kalshoven, K., Hartog, D.N. den, & de Hoogh, A.H.B. (2012). Ethical leadership and follower helping and courtesy: Moral awareness and empathic concern as moderators. *Wiley Online Library*, 62(2), 211-235. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
40. Krejcie, R.V., & Morgan, D.W. (1970). Determining Sample Size for Research Activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30(3), 607-610. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
41. Leweherilla Novalien, C. The antecedents of deviant workplace behaviours on the employees of regional apparatus organization (ODP) in Maluku province, Indonesia. Available at: [\[Link\]](#)
42. Liden, R.C., Wayne, S.J., Zhao, H., & Henderson, D. (2008). Servant leadership: Development of a multidimensional measure and multi-level assessment. *Leadership Quarterly*, 19(2), 161-177. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
43. Lu, C.S., & Lin, C.C. (2014). The Effects of Ethical Leadership and Ethical Climate on Employee Ethical Behavior in the International Port Context. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 124(2), 209-223. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
44. Mai, Y., Zhang, W., & Wang, L. (2019). Chinese Management Studies. *Researchgate.Net*, 13(2), 421-446. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
45. Mayer, D.M., Kuenzi, M., & Greenbaum, R.L. (2010). Examining the Link Between Ethical Leadership and Employee Misconduct: The Mediating Role of Ethical Climate. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 95(SUPPL. 1), 7-16. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
46. Mayer, D.M., Kuenzi, M., Greenbaum, R., Bardes, M., & Salvador, R.B. (2009). How low does ethical leadership flow? Test of a trickle-down model. *Organisational behavior and human decision processes*, 108(1), 1-13. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)

47. Mayer, D.M., Thau, S., Workman, K.M., Van Dijke, M., & De Cremer, D. (2012). Leader mistreatment, employee hostility, and deviant behaviours: Integrating self-uncertainty and thwarted needs perspectives on deviance. *Organisational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 117(1), 24-40. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
48. Mikulay, S., Neuman, G., & Finkelstein, L. (2001). Counterproductive workplace behaviours. *Genetic, Social, and General Psychology Monographs*, 127(3), 279. [\[Google Scholar\]](#)
49. Neves, P., & Story, J. (2015). Ethical Leadership and Reputation: Combined Indirect Effects on Organisational Deviance. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 127(1), 165-176. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
50. O'Keefe, D.F., Peach, J.M., & Messervey, D.L. (2019). The combined effect of ethical leadership, moral identity, and organisational identification on workplace behavior. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, 13(1), 20-35. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
51. Peng, A.C., & Kim, D. (2020). A meta-analytic test of the differential pathways linking ethical leadership to normative conduct. *Journal of Organisational Behavior*, 41(4), 348-368. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
52. Penney, L.M., Hunter, E.M., & Perry, S.J. (2011). Personality and counterproductive work behaviour: Using conservation of resources theory to narrow the profile of deviant employees. *Journal of Occupational and Organisational Psychology*, 84(1), 58-77. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
53. Reynolds, S.J. (2006). Moral awareness and ethical predispositions: Investigating the role of individual differences in the recognition of moral issues. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(1), 233. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
54. Reynolds, S. J. (2008). Moral attentiveness: Who pays attention to the moral aspects of life? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(5), 1027. [\[Google Scholar\]](#)
55. Riaz, A. (2018). Impact of ethical leadership on organisational cronyism through mediating role of ethical culture and moderating role of leader member exchange. *Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences (PJCSS)*, 12(3), 831-850. [\[Google Scholar\]](#)
56. Robinson, S., & Bennett, R. (1997). Workplace deviance: Its definition, its manifestations, and its causes. Available at: [\[Link\]](#)
57. Schaubroeck, J.M., Hannah, S.T., Avolio, B.J., Kozlowski, S.W., Lord, R.G., Treviño, L.K., ... & Peng, A.C. (2012). Embedding ethical leadership within and across organization levels. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55(5), 1053-1078. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
58. Schwarz, G., Eva, N., & Newman, A. (2020). Can Public Leadership Increase Public Service Motivation and Job Performance? *Public Administration Review*, 80(4), 543-554. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
59. Schwepker, C.H., & Dimitriou, C.K. (2021). Using ethical leadership to reduce job stress and improve performance quality in the hospitality industry. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 94, 102860. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
60. Sims, R.R., & Brinkman, J. (2002). Leaders as moral role models: The case of John Gutfreund at Salomon Brothers. *Journal of business ethics*, 35, 327-339. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
61. Spector, B. (2019). Moral leadership? Be careful what you wish for. *Leadership*, 15(1), 123-131. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
62. Spector, P.E., Fox, S., Penney, L.M., Bruursema, K., Goh, A., & Kessler, S. (2006). The dimensionality of counterproductivity: Are all counterproductive behaviours created equal? *Journal of vocational behavior*, 68(3), 446-460. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
63. Spector, P., & Fox, S. (2005). The Stressor-Emotion Model of Counterproductive Work Behavior. Available at: [\[Link\]](#)
64. Tajfel, H. (1974). Social identity and intergroup behaviour. *Social Science Information*, 13(2), 65-93. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
65. Taylor, S.G., & Pattie, M.W. (2014). When does ethical leadership affect workplace incivility? The moderating role of follower personality. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 24(4), 595-616. [\[Google Scholar\]](#)
66. Treviño, L.K., Brown, M., & Hartman, L.P. (2003). A qualitative investigation of perceived executive ethical leadership: Perceptions from inside and outside the executive suite. *Human Relations*, 56(1), 5-37. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
67. Treviño, L.K., den Nieuwenboer, N.A., & Kish-Gephart, J.J. (2014). Unethical behavior in organizations. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 65, 635-640. [\[CrossRef\]](#)
68. Van Gils, S., Van Quaquebeke, N., van Knippenberg, D., Van Dijke, M., & De Cremer, D. (2015). Ethical leadership and follower organisational deviance: The moderating role of follower moral attentiveness. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 26(2), 190-203. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)

69. van Knippenberg, D., & Sitkin, S.B. (2013). A Critical Assessment of Charismatic – Transformational Leadership Research: Back to the Drawing Board? *Academy of Management Annals*, 7(1), 1-60. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
70. Van Knippenberg, D., Van Knippenberg, B., De Cremer, D., & Hogg, M.A. (2004). Leadership, self, and identity: A review and research agenda. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 15(6), 825-856. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
71. Walumbwa, F.O., Mayer, D.M., Wang, P., Wang, H., Workman, K., & Christensen, A.L. (2011). Linking ethical leadership to employee performance: The roles of leader-member exchange, self-efficacy, and organisational identification. *Organisational behavior and human decision processes*, 115(2), 204-213. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
72. Wang, Y. de, & Sung, W.C. (2016). Predictors of Organisational Citizenship Behavior: Ethical Leadership and Workplace Jealousy. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 135(1), 117-128. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
73. Winterich, K.P., Aquino, K., Mittal, V., & Swartz, R. (2013). When moral identity symbolization motivates prosocial behavior: the role of recognition and moral identity internalization. *Journal of applied psychology*, 98(5), 759. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
74. Wolf, L. (2017). The removal from office of a president on section 89 of the Constitution. *South African Law Journal*, 134(1), 1-33. [\[Google Scholar\]](#)
75. Zhang, K., Zhao, B., & Yin, K. (2023). When Leaders Acknowledge Their Own Errors, Will Employees Follow Suit? A Social Learning Perspective. *Journal of Business Ethics*. [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
76. Zhang, Y., Zhou, F., & Mao, J. (2018). Ethical leadership and follower moral actions: Investigating an emotional linkage. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9(OCT). [\[Google Scholar\]](#) [\[CrossRef\]](#)
77. Zribi, H., & Souai, S. (2013). Deviant behaviours in response to organisational injustice: Mediator test for psychological contract breach-the case of Tunisia. *Journal of Business Studies Quarterly*, 4(4), 1. [\[Google Scholar\]](#)