



Ethical Leadership and Organizational justice: Moderating Role of Conscientiousness

Amna Ali, Assistant Professor, Iqra National University (am_pk97@yahoo.com)

Adil Adnan, Associate Professor, Iqra National University (adil_adnan99@yahoo.com)

Dr. Muhammad Ayub, Assist Professor (department of management sciences COMSATS University Islamabad Attock campus) ciiit-attok.edu.pk

Khalid Jamal, PhD scholar Iqra National University (Khalidjamal08@gmail.com)

Saima Gul, PhD scholar Iqra National University (saima.gul83@gmail.com)

Zaigham abbas (lecturer, inu) Zaigham@inu.edu.pk

Tauseef urrehman (phdscholar, inu) Tauseefurrehman2005@gmail.com

Abstract: The aim of this study was to find the effect of ethical leadership on organizational justice. This study also finds the moderating role of Conscientiousness on the relationship between ethical leadership and organizational justice. This study was conducted in higher education sector of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa, Pakistan. Cross-sectional research design was used in this study and n= 300 sample size was selected for this study. The results of the revealed that ethical leadership has positive and significant effect on all types of organizational justice. Moreover, the results also revealed that Conscientiousness has significant and positive moderating effect on the relationship between ethical leadership and organizational justice.

Key Words: Ethical Leadership, organizational justice and Conscientiousness

I. INTRODUCTION:

It is discovered that deceptive ethical leadership behavior is vital indicator of organizational productivity (Mete, 2013). The perceived goal plays a role of a mediator between the leadership member exchange and job performance. The relationship found by the researchers showed up a positive association amongst the mentioned variables (Namoga, 2017). Researchers from the field of Management have likewise come up with a demonstrated role in studying and developing ethical leadership in organizations. A significant collection of insightful work clarifies that because of the exploitative nature of organizations through the prevailing part that leadership affects the employee's outcome and their willingness to work more enthusiastically for the benefit of organization (Mayer, Greenbaum, Kuenzi, and Salvador, 2009). The ethical leadership has successfully drawn the attention of the local and global researchers in influencing the OCB and Job outcome.

It is known through different studies that ethical leadership (EL) have certain effects on un- usual behavior and organizational citizenship behavior. From these researches it is believed that the ethical style of leadership positively impacts organizational citizenship behavior as well as the un-usual behavior. These studies also showed relationship amongst EL & OCB. The ethical styles of leadership as well as the divergent behavior have weaker impact on employee self-esteem (Trevino et al., 2006; Hyder et al., 2013). Three aspects are being followed by most of the organizations i.e. assigned roles to be carried out by employees, retaining employees in their system and to exhibit advanced and impulsive events beyond requirements (Katz, 1964). For associations to work effectively these three prerequisites described by Katz, (1964) are critical. As such, organizations require those employees who are not only ready to perform their assigned tasks and duties within a mentioned time more proactively but also represent their creative thoughts and suggest innovative ways to deal with their work.

The corporate society in the world of business is also one of the prime victim of corruption and unethical style of political and public leadership (Chene, 2008). Summing up these reports are of a view that the unethical practices are most commonly exercised in the corporate world as well as in the society. As a matter of fact the good and evil exists all together. The prime objective and motivation behind selecting the said subject matter was to empirically investigate that whether the ethical style of leadership can help the organizational managers to improve and maintain the subordinates and the organizational performance.

Moreover to study the impact of mediating variable i.e. The Organizational justice on job outcome and impact of moderating variable i.e. conscientiousness between ethical leadership and Organizational justice. Thomas et al., (2004) revealed that the ethical leaders can better help the organizations to minimize their operational costs and expenditures and can enable them to increase their profit margins. Mayer et al., 2009; Walumbwa et al., 2009 are of a view that an ethical leadership better educate the organizational members to adapt and endorse the ethical behavior in a most desirable behavior that can produce positive impacts on the job performances of the employees. (Blau, 1964; Organ, 1988; Mathieu &Zajac, 1990; Judge, Thoresen, Bono, & Patton, 2001; Brown et al., 2005; 2006; Ali et al., 2018) are of a view that the ethical leadership also have a significant influence on the job satisfaction level of the work force.

Furthermore Picolo et al., (2010) revealed that the ethical leaders can better train their subordinates and can bring their job performance to the next level. Such type of leaders can create a charismatic sense of motivation in their subordinates and can make them most productive. Such type of motivational synergy between the ethical leaders and employees enhances the OCB and result in a better workplace environment (Bakker et al., 2004). Some other studies conducted by (Bakker et al., 2004; K. Michele et al., 2013) concluded that the leaders with an ethical behavior are in a better position to create positive influences in the job outcome of employees. The ethical leaders make a proper use of organizational justice and its various determinants that can produce positive impacts not only on the individual job performance but also on the organizational productivity. Moreover according to (Zhang et al., 2013), the followers of the ethical leaders are comparatively more motivated and productive as compared to the followers of unethical leaders. The job turnover rate is found to be minimum while the job satisfaction level is found to be maximum in followers of the ethical standards of job outcomes. The aim of this study is to find the effect of ethical leadership on organizational justice. This study also further investigate the moderating role of conscientiousness.

Moreover another study conducted by Zheng et al., (2015) suggested the further research work that may investigate the relation between ethical leadership and OJ. It is being encouraged to take both justice & leadership apart for measuring psychological procedure with a different variable to allow behaviors of leadership to be tested ethically. By suggesting ethical leaders as moral agents of any organization, a relation among ethical leadership behavior and organization justice has been found. Trust can also be considered as a mediating variable. Ethical behavior of leadership stimulates trust for the employees of organization so that it increases their loyalty towards it (Xu A et al., 2016). Also much of the areas of research related to ethical leadership is availed by developed countries.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW:

2.1 Relational approach to leadership:

Leadership is always considered as relation that is based on transactions (Bass, 1990) but in relation to this it was assumed egoistically that lead to an optimization of outcomes from leader and the follower. Indeed, in contrast in such approach the ethical eminence of leadership has showed increments on both the new methodologies (Whetstone, 2002). The transformational leader concept and servant leader highlight several other relations that is not limited to legally obligatory behavior on follower but produce finest outcomes together. On the other hand, the trans-formational leader motivates supporters for doing more than the expected (Bies, 1986). Ethical or Moral leadership refers to the demonstration of normal suitable behavior over personal movements & interpersonal relations. Moreover, promoting such type of behavior to supporters in a way like communication, strengthening as well as making choices (Brown, Trevino and Harison, 2005).

Though the local and global researches on EL are still on its very basic level, however many questions still needed to be discovered (Mayer, 2009). So the current study is based on this question that how the ethical or moral leadership is related to outcomes and what are the mechanism through which it relates with the outcomes. While making a comparison with the transactional type of approach, the ethical values of leadership are found to be exceptionally high (Whetstone, 2002). The ethical leaders are always concerned in building the ethical and moral values of their employees. The ethical leaders are strongly convinced over the significance of ethical style of leadership and they are always engaged in improving the ethical standards of the organizational members (Bass, 1985; Cardona, 2000). Burns, (1978); Bass and Steidlmeier, (1999) were of the same view by stating that the ethical leaders have positive influence on the activities and mind of the employees. These studies strongly believe that the ethical leaders can better perform the role of an intrinsic and extrinsic motivator by following the most desirable ethical standards that results in the improvement of both the individual and organizational performance. Ordinary definitions of leadership incorporate two key ideas: 1) making a convincing vision and 2) influencing followers with the end goal of accomplishing critical results (House et al., 2013). A more exact definition portraying the real procedure is exhibited by Yukl, (2013), "Leadership is the procedure of impacting employees to comprehend and understand the organizational activities, tasks, assignments, duties and responsibilities in a most ethically desirable manner.

2.2 Ethical leadership and organizational justice:

Boyett&Boyett (2003) suggests that understanding ethics is one of the important attribute of effective leaders can be better understood by understanding the philosophies of Plato and Aristotle. As a matter of fact Plato believes that the leader is someone who has wisdom, skill and experience while (Mendonca, 2001; Kouzes & Posner, 2002; Kanungo, 2004; Brown et al., 2005; Toor&Ofori, 2009) believe that ethical leaders must have the attributes like personal and professional integrity, honesty, fairness in dealing, respect for coworkers and subordinates, collective motivation and group decision making. Furthermore the ethical leaders ensure the practicing of moral values and standards through interpersonal and intrapersonal communication. In a situation where the ethical leaders are emphasizing over understanding and practicing the ethical values and interestingly they themselves do not possess and follow these moral values a most desirable ethical environment can never be created within the organization. Some of the previous studies revealed that the organizational members owe a greater importance over the treatment and revealing behavior of their coworkers and managers.

As a matter of fact these studies are of a view that organizational justice deeply focuses on the fair ways of treatment inside the workplaces (Greenberg, 1990; Cropanzano & Greenberg, 1997; Angelitis & Nabil, 2011). According to Colquitt, (2001) there are various dimensions of the organizational justice. The first dimension of organizational justice is the distributive justice which emphasis over the formulation and practices of rewards and punishments on the basis of the individual performances. Moreover Steeman&Visser, (2007) and Lavelle, (2010) are of the same views. According to these studies the distributive justice is of a remarkable importance in order to formulate and impose the reward and punishment procedures in the workplace. After the introduction and development of equity theory by Adams in (1963) the distributive justice has successfully drawn the attention of local and global managers and researchers. The second component of organizational justice is the procedural justice. As it deeply emphasis on the formulations and implications of policies and procedures that are being used to ensure that certain degree of fairness has been followed and exercised in the organizational day to day operations(Colquitt, 2001; Rhoades et al., 2001; Ambrose & Schminke, 2009; Greenberg, 2011).

Moreover, the procedural justice tends to define trust, neutrality and status factor that is important for the fair treatment with various organizational members (Folger & Cropanzano, 1998; Cropanzano et al., 2001). The final component of organizational justice is known as interactional justice. The ITJ refers to the extent and nature of the interpersonal and intra personal treatment with organizational members (Bies & Moag, 1986). Moreover Bies, (2001) is of a view that interactional justice has certain differences from that of the procedural justice while some of the authors are of the view that interactional justice is nothing but just a component of the procedural justice (Greenberg, 1993; Lind & Tyler 1988).

According to Colquitt (2001) various studies on organizational justice have revealed that the organization's policies and procedures greatly influence the employee based perceptions about the procedural and

distributive justice. Moreover Ambrose et al., (2007) revealed that the attitude of the employees towards organizational policies and procedures act as a mediating factor between the ethical leadership and job outcome. According to (Bies&Moag 1986; Folger, 1998; Cohen & Spector, 2001; Hakanen&Schaufeli, 2012) the organizational managers or the supervisors are of primary importance in shaping and reshaping the interactional justice within the organizations. Mc Gregor (1960) in his research study emphasized over the ethical style of leadership as a primary concern that can lead towards justice based decision making, procedures and hence can help the managers to reduce the ethically undesirable behavior. Furthermore Chaughtai et al., (2014) have strongly endorsed the same facts and findings in their study by stating that the managers through the intrapersonal and interpersonal relationships can better elevate the moral standards of their workforce. According to Roberson & Colquitt, (2005) the organizational managers by presenting themselves as a role model can better shape and reshape the employee perceptions and attitudes towards creating and maintaining the ethically desirable working environment. Another study conducted by Cohen & Spector, (2001) and Cropanzano et al., (2007) revealed that the organizational managers can play an influential role towards ensuring ethical work climate by presenting themselves as a perceived role model.

Moreover Rupp & Cropanzano, (2002) revealed that the employee and management relationships are greatly influenced by the interactional justice and the way through which the interactional justice is being exercised. Some other studies conducted by Brown, (2005); Roberson & Colquitt, (2005), De Gieter et al., (2012) indicated that the employee based perceptions of organizational justice and its various determinants remarkably influence the ethical environment within the organization. These studies strongly believed that the organizational leaders must demonstrate a behavior that is most likely to be trustworthy and fair. They must realize their role importance in influencing the behavior of their subordinates. Mendonca, (2001) strongly believes that the organizational managers must act as a perceived role model in the inter and intra personal relationships with their coworkers and subordinates. In this way the organizational managers can better promote the ethically desirable working environment and the group decision making.

Toor&Ofori, (2009) revealed that the ethical managers always provide open communication and coordination channels to their coworkers. As a result all the ethical issues can be openly communicated and resolved so that a justice based environment can be built. Trevino et al., (2003) also emphasized over the strategic importance of ethical leadership by stating that accountability should be one of the organizational dimensions. This accountability feature of the organization enforces the managers to follow ethically desirable behavior. In this study 20 top executives and top managers were interviewed. Findings revealed that accountability is one of the most important dimensions of the organizational policies that can ensure the ethical behavior.

As a matter of fact the organizational managers on the basis of their legitimate power can better control and allocate the organizational resources, the workload and the justice based environment. According to Loi et al., (2009) the organizational managers are most often seen as the organizational agents. Lind, (2001) is of a view that the ethical leaders can better strengthened the employees believes and perceptions about the procedural justice that can minimize the fearful feelings of job insecurity. Brown, (2007) is of a same view that the organizational leaders are like in charge of the organizational team. They can provide the right direction to their employees or subordinates job inputs. As a matter of fact the followers most of the time look at their group leaders when they are faced with an ethical dilemmas. Moreover while talking about the individual behavior the ethical leaders can better direct them towards the right path by presenting himself as a role model. According to Trevino and Brown, (2007) if the organizational managers are perceived as trustworthy, honest, fair, caring and reliable they would surely follow their footprints and their job outcome will be positively influenced.

As far as the professional behavior of the employees is concerned it can also be positively influenced by the ethical leaders. As the ethical managers set the open communication and coordination channels through which the ethical expectations and standards are openly communicated and controlled. A reward and a punishment system is carefully devised and implemented. This better enables the employees and coworkers to understand and follow the ethically desirable behavior. Moreover this can also result in maximizing the job outcome and the organizational citizenship behavior (Trevino & Brown, 2007). According to Neubert et al., (2007) the ethical managers play a very remarkable role in influencing a fair decision making system through

the appropriate use of procedural justice. Alexander&Ruderman, (1987) and Scandura, (1997), found that the organizational justice greatly influences the job outcome and organizational citizenship behavior. It is a common observation that the organizational leaders on the basis of their legitimate power can better shape and reshape a fairly desirable work environment. This objective can be achieved through the engagement and commitment of the organizational members towards the creation of a justice based environment.

By suggesting ethical leaders as moral agents of any organization, an association between the ethical leader behavior and the organizational justice has been found. As a mediating variable trust can also be considered. Moreover the Ethical leader behavior stimulates employees' confidence in their organization, which as a result promotes their justice perceptions towards the organization (Xu A. et al., 2016). Various social scientists have deeply acknowledged the overall significance of organizational justice as a tool to improve the individual and organizational productivity. Brown & his fellow researchers (2005) as well as Kalshoven& his fellow researchers (2011) believe that the ethical leaders must include fairness as an essential ingredient of treatment with their coworkers. They argue that they should strictly follow the policy of non-favoritism. Moreover the ethical leaders should always base their decisions and choices upon the ethical values to ensure the appropriate application of organizational justice principles. Furthermore Northouse, (2001) is of a view that it is one of the most significant pillars of leadership. On the other hand Johnson, (2009) deeply emphasis over importance of the ethical leadership as this always tends to bring fairness, justice and equal level of treatment with the organizational members. The distributive justice has been nominated as one of the important predictors of job outcomes i.e. pay satisfaction and the job satisfaction than the procedural form of justice. In addition to this the distributive justice and the procedural justice also keep an important place and role in influencing the organizational and individual job outcome (Xu, A. et al., 2016).

In the 21st century marketplace managers are faced with different types and levels of ethical issues. Most of these issues are based on ethical violations eg. in a situation where fair standard operating procedures are not appropriately and substantially followed. Secondly the result of such decisions is always recorded as negative. These types of situations can be most possibly avoided if all the organizational members strictly follow the ethical values in their actions and reactions and in the overall managerial and organizational decision making process (Schminke, Ambrose &Neol, 1997). In addition to this the fair procedures and fair outcomes are interrelated. This implies that if the ethical leaders ensure fair practices and procedures within the overall organizational setup it will surely result in achieving the desired results in a most effective and an efficient manner. For the motivation and retention of the organizational members the understanding and implication of these various determinants of organizational justice is quite mandatory to improve the individual and organizational job performance (Colquit, Conlon, Wesson, Portal &Negies, 2001).

According to Trevino & Brown, (2007) the ethical leader is a person with high level of morality who always believes in doing the things in the right way. Moreover the ethical leaders are trustworthy, supremely honest, fair endeavors and they always follow a principled behavior while they are making decisions. They always have a very caring attitude towards their subordinates and coworkers, are supportive and kind hearted (Trevino & Brown, 2007). Their personal and professional behavior always compels them to behave in the most ethically appropriate manner with their coworkers and subordinates. They always set high ethical standards inside the organization by presenting themselves as a role model in the first place. They always develop and appreciate open communication channels inside the organization for the closer coordination between the various organizational members.

The ethical leaders are always interested and engaged in devising and implementing the ethical standards as a benchmark to be followed by them and their coworkers. In addition to this they always encourage a positive sense of competition between the organizational members through the formulation of reward and punishment systems (Trevino & Brown, 2007). The ethical leaders are highly effective at creating and maintaining the job commitment level of employees at various job positions. They have a primary concern in terms of making the most ethical decisions and having an equal and fair attitude with employees regardless of their gender and job positions etc. (Trevino & Brown, 2006; Neubert et al., 2009). Furthermore organizational members who are working under unfair and dishonest leaders show an increased level of inconsistency and performance downfall. They are also found guilty of creating a bad name for themselves and their organization. They badly fail in fulfilling and following the organizational procedures, rules and regulations.

Such type of behavior is not good both for the individuals and for the organization. Moreover such type of highly undesirable behavior is the most expected outcome of unethical leadership. As a matter of fact the unethical leaders in the first place are not interested and engaged in the formulation and imposition of ethical behavior. Moreover they also fail in communicating and imposing the same to their coworkers (Lin et al., 2009).

On the other hand the leaders who are having a deeper knowledge and sense of moral and ethical values present themselves as a role model. By doing so they successfully communicate and impose the ethical standards amongst the organizational members (Brown et al., 2005). They pose a higher degree of emphasis towards following the organizational practices and policies. This can better result in improving and maintaining the job performances both at the individual and organizational level. As a matter of fact when employees are highly aware of their rights, duties, responsibilities they are in a better position to demonstrate the expected and highly desirable ethical behavior. They have a higher degree of motivation towards personal and organizational goal accomplishments by following and adopting the ethical behaviors. This is most possibly the expected outcome of ethical leadership (Carrol, 2004).

According to Walumbwa & Schubroeck, (2009) ethical leaders are highly effective at producing the most desirable ethical behavior both at the individual and organizational levels. Ethical leadership also claims a high level of significance towards creating job autonomy, the task significance and job satisfaction (Picolo et al., 2010). Loi et al., (2012), revealed the fact that the ethical leadership can better result in creating and maintaining the interactional justice inside the 21st century competitive organizational setups. The creation of interactional justice increases the overall supervisory effectiveness of ethical leaders. It most often results in creating a highly desirable OCB (Mayer et al., 2009 & Liu et al., 2013). Another study conducted by Neubert et al., (2009) is of a view that the ethical leaders are in a better position to exercise the interactional justice that can better influence the employee's perceptions. Hence can result in the creation of a highly desirable ethical environment. This study is also of a view that ethical leadership can better conceptualize and empirically distinguish between the overall performance of ethical and unethical leaders. According to this study the interactional justice is the most critical dimensions of OJ that can create best harmony between the individuals and groups (Toor & Afori, 2009; Kalshoven et al., 2011; Mayer et al., 2012). On the basis of the above mentioned literature and arguments given by the previous studies, the researcher has developed the following hypothesis.

H1: there is an association between the ethical leadership and Distributive justice

H2: there is an association between the ethical leadership and Procedural Justice

H3: there is an association between the ethical leadership and Interactional Justice

2.3 Moderating Role of Conscientiousness:

The conscientiousness is considered to be the most powerful factor amongst five factor model when the personality researchers are interested in knowing the working behavior of employees. According to McCrae & Costa, (1987); Digman, (1990); Mount & Barrick, (1995) the conscientiousness is comprised of two aspects: 1. Achievement 2. Dependability. According to Johnson & Ostendorf, (1993) the individuals who are having lower ranking on the conscientiousness's spectrum are found to be careless, disorganized and the one who can be easily confused and distracted. As a matter of fact the individuals who are highly ranked at the higher end of conscientiousness they are found to be: (1) high performance achievers, disciplined, honest and cultural following (John & Srivastava, 1999), (2) careful thinkers and followers of ethical standards (Costa & McCrae, 1992), (3) As an organizational leader they always prefer to demonstrate the ethically desirable behavior (Kalshoven et al., 2011). According to Barrick & Mount, (1991) the employees who are having higher ranks of conscientiousness are found to be dedicated, hardworking and diligent. Moreover they are highly efficient as compared to their coworkers and they are perceived as high performance oriented.

According to Meredith et al., (2009) the employees who were ranked highly on the conscientiousness scale were found to be more productive, fair, honest, dependable and high performance oriented as compared to their fellow workers. According to Digman, (1990) the five factor model is highly significant for the ethical leaders when they want to predict the individual's employee job outcome as well as the organizational

productivity (Barrick & Mount, 1991). In addition to this (Salgado, 2002) revealed that the five factor model is also highly influential in measuring the counterproductive working behavior of employees. Organ & Ryan, (1995) are of a view that the conscientiousness factor also helps the organizational leaders to create and maintain a desirable OCB.

H4: Conscientiousness moderates the relationship between ethical leadership and Distributive justice

H5: Conscientiousness moderates the relationship between ethical leadership and Procedural justice

H6: Conscientiousness moderates the relationship between ethical leadership and Interactional justice

III. METHODOLOGY:

3.1 Population and Sample:

The current study helps in understanding the role and importance of ethical leadership in influencing the job outcomes of teaching staff employed at the public and private sector Universities of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa. This study intended to explore the influence of EL on the organizational justice of employees while considering conscientiousness as a moderator. The cross-sectional approach was used in this study. The sample size of this study was 300 in higher education sector of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa.

3.2 Measurement Instruments:

3.2.1 Ethical Leadership:

Brown (2005) developed Ethical Leadership Scale (ELS) that is being implemented in the current study. There are 10 items of scale. For instance an item can be, "reasonable and sensible decisions are made by our head of the organization". 0.87 was the Cronbach's alpha of ethical leadership.

3.2.2 Organizational Justice:

Colquitt, J.A (2001) developed 4-items scale for measuring the distributive justice. The above mentioned study has reliability Chronbachalpha of 0.83. The 7-items scale has also been developed by Colquitt, J. A. (2001). It reflects official processes that will be used to make decisions for measuring procedural justice. The above study has reliability alpha value of 0.89. There are two parts of interactional justice. The first one is the interpersonal justice and the second one is known as informational justice. The items scale designed by Colquitt, J. A. (2001) is most commonly used for measuring the interpersonal justice. 5-items scale is generally used for measuring the informational justice. The scale prescribed by Colquitt, (2001) reasonably explains the procedures required for measuring interaction justice by the supervisor of employees. The above mentioned study has reliability value of 0.86.

3.2.3 The Conscientiousness:

9-items scale measuring the conscientiousness has been developed by John, Donahue and Kentle, (1991); John and Srivastva, (1999). In order to measure the conscientiousness the 5-point scale has been designed. Its ranges from 1= strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree. The Cronbach alpha value reported by the above mentioned study is 0.70.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION:

4.1 Descriptive Statistics and Correlation Analysis:

The mean value of ethical leadership were (M=3.23, SD=1.35), conscientiousness (M=3.92, SD= 1.47), Distributive justice (M=4.38, SD=1.31), procedural justice (M=3.99, SD=1.49), interactional justice (M=4.42, SD= 1.20), informational justice (M= 4.47, SD= 1.44).

The correlation between ethical leadership and distributive justice ($r = .32$), procedural justice ($r = .31$), interactional justice ($r = .29$) and informational justice ($r = .26$) are positive and significant. The correlation between distributive justice and conscientiousness ($r = .35$), procedural justice and conscientiousness ($r = .29$), interactional justice and conscientiousness ($r = .26$) and informational justice with conscientiousness ($r = .28$) are positive and significant.

4.2 Model Fit Indices of each study variables

Table 4.1

Model Test	χ^2	χ^2 / DF	CFI	NFI	TLI	GFI	AGFI	RMR	RMSEA
Ethical Leadership	823.960	2.123	.94	.93	.94	.97	.90	.04	.05
Distributive Justice	14.382	4.011	.95	.94	.93	.96	.95	.03	.07
Procedural Justice	559.83	4.010	.94	.92	.98	.96	.91	.05	.06
Interactional Justice	14.526	4.121	.97	.91	.96	.93	.94	.04	.06
Informational Justice	159.38	3.831	.94	.92	.94	.97	.94	.05	.040
Conscientiousness	784.58	2.242	.97	.92	.95	.93	.94	.02	.06

The confirmatory factor analysis shows that all variables of the study have good model fit and the data fit the model.

4.3 Moderating Analysis:

Table 4.2: Interactive effects of conscientiousness and Ethical leadership on Organizational Justice:

	DJ		PJ		IJ	
	β	ΔR^2	β	ΔR^2	β	ΔR^2
Step 1						
Organization	.26***		.21***		.24***	
Tenure	.17***		.16***		.17***	
		.27***				.24***
Step 2						
Conscientiousness	.28***		.21***		.29***	
Ethical Leadership	.19***		.20***		.20***	
Step 3						
Conscientiousness* EL	.15**		.22**		.28***	
		.19**		.20***		.21***

Note: N= 511

* $p < .06$

* $p < .05$

** $p < .01$

*** $p < .001$

Table 4.2 (step 2) showed results associated to the impact of EL and conscientiousness on distributive justice. As per the results of the present study the EL has affirmative and significant influences on distributive justice ($\beta = .15$, $p < 0.001$). The results concluded that the ethical leadership has a positive and significant relationship with procedural justice ($\beta = .14$, $p < 0.001$). Furthermore, results shown in table 4.4 (step 2) revealed that the

ethical leadership has a positive relationship with interactional justice ($\beta = .12, p < 0.001$) & similarly table 4.4 (step 2) results revealed a positively significant relationship between EL and informational justice ($\beta = .10, p < 0.01$).

For moderation analysis, the researcher entered the interaction term of ethical leadership and conscientiousness in step 3 of the regression analysis. The derived significant value confirms the moderation impact of EL on conscientiousness.

The results of the main and the combined impacts of the conscientiousness & ethical leadership on organizational justice i.e DJ, PJ and IJ are shown in table 4.4 (step 3). Results reported the moderating influence of conscientiousness on the association between the ethical leadership and organizational justice. Moreover results revealed that the interaction term between ethical leadership and conscientiousness were found significant with organizational justice i.e DJ ($\beta = .15, p < 0.001$), PJ ($\beta = .22, p < 0.001$) and IJ ($\beta = .28, p < 0.001$). Therefore conscientiousness significantly acts as a moderating variable over the association between ethical leadership and organizational justice.

V. CONCLUSION:

Ethical leadership is one of the newly emerging and a powerful tool. It helps the organizational leaders to influence their job outcome in a most desirable manner (Ivana, 2017). Moreover the ethical leaders are in a better position to present themselves as a perceived role model when they wish to enhance the individual and organizational productivity. The ethical leaders are highly specialized in molding the behavior of their employees and coworkers in an ethically desirable manner (Zhu et al., 2013). The subordinates of the ethical leaders are well trained, experienced, skillful, honest and highly credible. As compared to the followers of unethical leaders they are high performance oriented. The followers of the ethical leaders are highly consistent and hardworking (Zhang, 2013). The ethical leaders make an appropriate use of the organizational justice theory that can positively influence the job outcome of employees. The various determinants of OJ are properly practiced in day to day organizational operations to ensure higher levels of productivity. The ethical leaders are highly sensitive and efficient towards creating and maintaining a favorable OCB (at an individual and organizational level) (Piccolo et al., 2010). The ethical leaders put their best energies towards increasing conscientiousness levels of employees that can better lead towards goal achievement.

This study provides an opportunity to observe the model and theories which were previously tested in the western context. The current study intended to do the same in the Eastern context to give clear implications for both practitioner and the managers in a developing country like Pakistan. This study focused on the ethical leadership and work outcome framework to provide some useful and interesting findings by using organizational justice as a mediating mechanism through which ethical leadership is closely related with the work outcomes. While conscientiousness was found a positive catalyst between the organizational justice and the job outcomes relationship. The findings of this study are different from so many Western studies.

REFERENCES:

1. Ali, A., Ahmad, S., & Saeed, I. (2018). Ethical Leadership and Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Mediating Role of Organizational Justice: A Case Study of Education Sector. *Abasyn Journal of Social Sciences*, 11(2), 386-399.
2. 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.
3. Baker, M. R., Frazier, P. A., Greer, C., Paulsen, J. A., Howard, K., Meredith, L. N., ... & Shallcross, S. L. (2016). Sexual victimization history predicts academic performance in college women. *Journal of counseling psychology*, 63(6), 685.
4. Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological review*, 84(2), 191.
5. Bandura, A. (1986). Fearful expectations and avoidant actions as coeffects of perceived self-inefficacy.

6. Barrick, M. R., & Mount, M. K. (1991). The big five personality dimensions and job performance: a meta-analysis. *Personnel psychology*, 44(1), 1-26.
7. Bass, B. M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational dynamics*, 18(3), 19-31.
8. Blau, P. M. (1964). Justice in social exchange. *Sociological inquiry*, 34(2), 193-206.
9. Bouckennooghe, D., De Clercq, D., & Deprez, J. (2014). Interpersonal justice, relational conflict, and commitment to change: The moderating role of social interaction. *Applied Psychology*, 63(3), 509-540.
10. Bouckennooghe, D., Zafar, A., & Raja, U. (2015). How ethical leadership shapes employees' job performance: The mediating roles of goal congruence and psychological capital. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 129(2), 251-264.
11. Brown, K. W., Ryan, R. M., & Creswell, J. D. (2005). Mindfulness: Theoretical foundations and evidence for its salutary effects. *Psychological inquiry*, 18(4), 211-237.
12. Brown, L. A. (2007). *Extra role time organizational citizenship behavior, expectations for reciprocity, and burnout: potential organizational influence via organizational support and psychological contract fulfillment* (Doctoral dissertation, Northwestern University).
13. Brown, M. E., & Treviño, L. K. (2006). Ethical leadership: A review and future directions. *The leadership quarterly*, 17(6), 595-616.
14. 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.
15. 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.
16. Cohen, J., Cohen, P., West, S. G., & Aiken, L. S. (2013). *Applied multiple regression/correlation analysis for the behavioral sciences*. Routledge.
17. De Hoogh, A. H., & Den Hartog, D. N. (2008). Ethical and despotic leadership, relationships with leader's social responsibility, top management team effectiveness and subordinates' optimism: A multi-method study. *The leadership quarterly*, 19(3), 297-311.
18. Digman, J. M. (1990). Personality structure: Emergence of the five-factor model. *Annual review of psychology*, 41(1), 417-440.
19. Dunn, W. S., Mount, M. K., Barrick, M. R., & Ones, D. S. (1995). Relative importance of personality and general mental ability in managers' judgments of applicant qualifications. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 80(4), 500.
20. Eisenbeis, S. A. (2012). Re-thinking ethical leadership: An interdisciplinary integrative approach. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 23(5), 791-808.
21. Funder, D. C. (2001). Towards a resolution of the personality triad: Persons, situations, and behaviors. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 40(1), 21-34.
22. Gini, A. (1998). Work, identity and self: How we are formed by the work we do. *Journal of business ethics*, 17(7), 707-714.
23. Goldberg, L. R. (1990). An alternative" description of personality": the big-five factor structure. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 59(6), 1216.
24. Goldberg, L. R. (1992). The development of markers for the Big-Five factor structure. *Psychological assessment*, 4(1), 26.
25. Halbesleben, J. R., Harvey, J., & Bolino, M. C. (2009). Too engaged? A conservation of resources view of the relationship between work engagement and work interference with family. *Journal of applied psychology*, 94(6), 1452.
26. Hogan, R., Hogan, J., & Roberts, B. W. (1996). Personality measurement and employment decisions: Questions and answers. *American psychologist*, 51(5), 469.
27. Inceoglu, I., & Warr, P. (2011). Personality and job engagement. *Journal of Personnel Psychology*.
28. John, O. P., & Srivastava, S. (1999). The Big-Five trait taxonomy: History, measurement, and theoretical perspectives (Vol. 2, pp. 102-138). Berkeley: University of California.
29. John, O. P., Donahue, E. M., & Kentle, R. L. (1991). Big five inventory. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*.
30. Johnson, J. A., & Ostendorf, F. (1993). Clarification of the five-factor model with the Abridged Big Five Dimensional Circumplex. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 65(3), 563.

31. Kalshoven, K., Den Hartog, D. N., & De Hoogh, A. H. (2011). Ethical leadership at work questionnaire (ELW): Development and validation of a multidimensional measure. *The leadership quarterly*, 22(1), 51-69.
32. Kuvaas, B., & Buch, R. (2018). Leader-member exchange relationships and follower outcomes: The mediating role of perceiving goals as invariable. *Human Resource Management*, 57(1), 235-248.
33. Kuvaas, B., & Buch, R. (2018). Leader-member exchange relationships and follower outcomes: The mediating role of perceiving goals as invariable. *Human Resource Management*, 57(1), 235-248.
34. Lee, K., & Allen, N. J. (2002). Organizational citizenship behavior and workplace deviance: The role of affect and cognitions. *Journal of applied psychology*, 87(1), 131.
35. LePine, J. A. (2003). Team adaptation and postchange performance: effects of team composition in terms of members' cognitive ability and personality. *Journal of applied psychology*, 88(1), 27.
36. 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.
37. 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. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes*, 108(1), 1-13.
38. McCrae, R. R. (1987). Creativity, divergent thinking, and openness to experience. *Journal of personality and social psychology*, 52(6), 1258.
39. McCrae, R. R., Costa, P. T., de Lima, M. P., Simões, A., Ostendorf, F., Angleitner, A., ... & Piedmont, R. L. (1999). Age differences in personality across the adult life span: parallels in five cultures. *Developmental psychology*, 35(2), 466.
40. Mete, O., Lopes, M. B., & Asa, S. L. (2013). Spindle cell oncocytomas and granular cell tumors of the pituitary are variants of pituitary adenoma. *The American journal of surgical pathology*, 37(11), 1694-1699.
41. Minson, J. A., & Monin, B. (2012). Do-gooder derogation: Disparaging morally motivated minorities to defuse anticipated reproach. *Social Psychological and Personality Science*, 3(2), 200-207.
42. Mostert, K., & Rothmann, S. (2006). Work-related well-being in the South African Police Service. *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 34(5), 479-491.
43. Nerstad, C. G., Dysvik, A., Kuvaas, B., & Buch, R. (2018). Negative and positive synergies: On employee development practices, motivational climate, and employee outcomes. *Human Resource Management*, 57(5), 1285-1302.
44. Organ, D. W., & Ryan, K. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel psychology*, 48(4), 775-802.
45. Piccolo, R. F., Greenbaum, R., Hartog, D. N. D., & Folger, R. (2010). The relationship between ethical leadership and core job characteristics. *Journal of organizational behavior*, 31(2-3), 259-278.
46. Podsakoff, N. P., Whiting, S. W., Podsakoff, P. M., & Blume, B. D. (2009). Individual-and organizational-level consequences of organizational citizenship behaviors: A meta-analysis. *Journal of applied Psychology*, 94(1), 122.
47. Salgado, J. F. (2002). The Big Five personality dimensions and counterproductive behaviors. *International journal of selection and assessment*, 10(1-2), 117-125.
48. Treviño, L. K., Weaver, G. R., & Reynolds, S. J. (2006). Behavioral ethics in organizations: A review. *Journal of management*, 32(6), 951-990.
49. Wayne, S. J., Shore, L. M., & Liden, R. C. (1997). Perceived organizational support and leader-member exchange: A social exchange perspective. *Academy of Management journal*, 40(1), 82-111.
50. Wayne, S. J., Shore, L. M., Bommer, W. H., & Tetrick, L. E. (1997). The role of fair treatment and rewards in perceptions of organizational support and leader-member exchange. *Journal of applied psychology*, 87(3), 590.
51. Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of management*, 17(3), 601-617.
52. Zafar, H., & Khalily, M. T. (2015). Didactic therapy for management of stress and co-morbid symptoms of depression and anxiety in Pakistani adolescents. *Pakistan Journal of Psychological Research*, 131-149.
53. Zhou, W. J., Wan, Q. Q., Liu, C. Y., Feng, X. L., & Shang, S. M. (2017). Determinants of patient loyalty to healthcare providers: An integrative review. *International Journal for Quality in Health Care*, 29(4), 442-449.