International Journal of Academic Pedagogical Research (IJAPR)
ISSN: 2643-9123
Vol. 9 Issue 10 October - 2025, Pages: 16-28

Exploring the Link Between Ethical Leadership and Trust in Higher Education Institutions

Richard C. Pasco[1]

[1]Department of Public Administration, Bukidnon State University
Malaybalay City, Bukidnon, Philippines
richardpasco@buksu.edu.ph

Abstract: *Ethical leadership is seen as key to the survival of an organization and trust is viewed as a significant factor to establish reliance and cooperation. This quantitative descriptive-correlational study describes and examines the relationship between the perceived ethical leadership and faculty trust in schools. Proportionate stratified random sampling was used to target the population size of 139 faculties from three different Bukidnon State University satellite campuses, Bukidnon, for S.Y. 20212022. Descriptive statistics, One-Way ANOVA with post hoc Tukey test, and bivariate correlations were utilized for the data analysis. Results revealed that, in terms of gender, more than half of the participants were female. When it comes to their ages, the majority of them were between 26-40 years old and almost all of them had only been in the service for less than three years. The campus cluster profile had shown that the participants in this study were well distributed and represented across campuses. In general, the faculty perceived their heads or school leaders as righteous people and ethical leaders with very high ethical beliefs and values. The overall faculty trust in their campus-in charge, colleagues, and clients range from high to very high. Among the factors in the profile, only the campus cluster revealed a statistically significant difference in ethical leadership while non-significant differences in gender, age, and length of service were found during the analysis. The Post Hoc Tukey test revealed that the statistically significant differences were noted between North and Central Cluster only. It can be inferred from the variation of the results among the campuses that ethical leadership is manifested and perceived differently. Among the factors in the profile, only the campus cluster revealed a statistically significant difference in trust in schools while nonsignificant differences in gender, age, and length of service were found during the analysis. From the univariate result, faculty's level of trust varies among school campuses. This is likely due to the faculty's different experiences with their respective schools. The Post Hoc Tukey test revealed that the statistically significant differences were noted between North and Central Cluster only. The results suggest that teachers' trust towards their heads was distinct. It might be that this is due to the leader's behavior and their efforts in maintaining a healthy relationship among teachers. There is a moderate positive magnitude of the correlation between the general perceived ethical leadership and faculty' trust in schools. This implies that the leaders are demonstrating ethical values which has an effect on the trust of the faculty. Thus, an increase in teachers' perceived ethical leadership has a moderate effect on the increase of teachers' trust in schools. It is recommended for schools on occasion to conduct seminars related to ethical leadership and how it could help build trust in a school organization.*

Keywords: ethical leadership, trust, ethical beliefs

1. INTRODUCTION

Ethical leadership is viewed as an attribute of good management and supervision in an organization. Ethical leaders tend to exhibit acceptable social behavior in dealing with employees. As mentioned by Khan & Javed (2018), ethical leadership is about having the personal characteristics, behaviors, decision-making attitudes that are centered on morality and moral management of others in an organization. It is "the demonstration of a normatively pertinent deed in the way of individual activity and interpersonal relation, and stimulating such behaviors to the followers via two-way communication, supplementation, and decision-making".

Brown, Treviño, & Harrison (2005) stated that ethical leaders are characterized as honest, caring, and principled individuals who make fair and balanced decisions. In addition, according to Kalshoven et al. (2011), ethical leaders treat their followers with respect, keep promises, allow employees to have input in decisions, and clarify expectations and responsibilities. Since ethical leadership is leadership that is directed by respect for ethical beliefs and values and the dignity and rights of others, it is thus related to concepts such as honesty, consideration, charisma, fairness, and trust (Brown, Trevino, & Harrison 2005).

According to Caudle (2019), the reasons why an individual chooses to trust or distrust another individual vary due to different contexts and relationships, making it difficult to define specific leadership behaviors without some guiding principles. As stated by Hoy & Tschannen-Moran (1999), there are five facets of trust commonly considered the most influential dimensions of a trusting relationship: (a) benevolence, (b) honesty, (c) openness, (d) competence, and (e) reliability, each facet can develop or destroy the level of trust that exists between the individuals within an organization and is based on the actions and behaviors performed by each person in the relationship. Yet, how leadership behaviors influence whether faculties place their trust in their school leader and determine the relationship between the level of trust that the faculties have in their head, faculty efficacy, and student achievement outcomes are not clearly understood.

In an educational organization, the school leaders are bound to model strong moral character traits to inculcate good values among the teachers and learners. Thus, the school leaders, as well as the teachers, are expected to display the highest ethical values to bring desirable changes in the behavior of the students. A school is an institutional organization where trust is an essential factor to establish reliance and cooperation. Trust is a complex emotion: an interaction that one person may perceive as trustworthy, another person may not. MacNeil et al. (1998) said that in an organization like the school, the challenge for the head is to recognize which leadership behaviors have the greatest impact on each employee's perception of trust and respond to it appropriately.

The purpose of this study was to describe the level of faculty's perception of ethical leadership of the school head and the level of trust that the faculty have in the members of the organization, as well as to determine the relationship between ethical leadership and trust. Moreover, the study aimed to correlate ethical leadership and faculty's trust in school. The study intended to provide substantial information to benefit the school and how the faculties perceive their trust towards their school leader's ethical leadership that might be instrumental to their trust in school. Consequently, organizations must be familiar with the divergence styles of ethical leadership that would assist construct affinity and a trustworthy place for workers.

2. METHODS

2.1 Research Design

The descriptive-correlational research design was used as a factfinding strategy in the conduct of this study. This study described the variables' (ethical leadership and trust in school) relationship towards each other and how it influences the whole organization. The study identified first the level of faculty's perception of ethical leadership and the level of faculty's trust in the school members. Second, the study identified the significance of perceived ethical leadership and trust based on the profile of the respondents. Lastly, the study determined the relationship between ethical leadership and trust.

2.2 Research Locale

The study was conducted at Bukidnon State University. BukSU is an educational institution located at the heart of the Bukidnon province, Malaybalay City. It has started its operation when it was founded in the year 1924 where it was formerly named Bukidnon Normal School. It became a university from the passage of the Republic Act No. 9456 signed by the former Philippine President Gloria Macapagal Arroyo which converted it into a university. BukSU community is a big community comprising of Main Campus, and External Satellite Campuses (ESC). Moreover, this study will focus on the External Satellite Campuses of BukSU. In the year 2018, Senator Juan Miguel F. Zubiri became a prime mover in the creation of BukSU-ESC which aims to provide quality education to more students. Currently, there are sixteen active satellite campuses across the province of Bukidnon and the province of Misamis Oriental that delivers its daily functions such as giving educational services to the community. Because the ESC was a big community, it was clustered into three factions accordingly; Central Cluster, North Cluster, and South Cluster. BukSU ESC Central Cluster comprises of the municipality of Baungon, Cabanglasan, Impasugong, Libona, San Fernando and, Talakag. BukSU ESC North Cluster comprises of the municipality of Alubijid, Medina, Malitbog, Sugbongcogon, and Talisayan. BukSU ESC South Cluster comprises of the municipality of Damulog, Kadingilan, Kalilangan, Kitaotao, and Quezon.

2.3 Sampling Design

Proportionate stratified random sampling was used to target the population size of the faculties from three different clusters under the Bukidnon State University for the School Year (S.Y.) 2021-2022. Data coding was employed for confidentiality. The sampling that was used ensures the presence of the key subgroups within the sample or the population (Maheshwari, 2017).

2.4 Respondents of the Study

The The respondents of the study were those full-time faculty teaching in the satellite campuses of BUKSU for the current S.Y. 2021-2022. Cluster 1 was the BUKSU ESC Central Cluster, Cluster 2 was the BUKSU ESC North Cluster, and Cluster 3 was the BUKSU ESC South Cluster. The sample size computation is presented in the table below:

Table 1. Sample Size Computation Representation

School	Population Size	Sample Size
Cluster 1	65	54
Cluster 2	51	42
Cluster 3	54	43
Total	170	139

2.5 Research Instrument

The study questionnaire was divided into three parts. The first part was the letter of consent, the second part was the brief profile of the faculties which includes, name (optional), age, sex, length of service, and the cluster where they belong; the third part were the questionnaire for ethical leadership and questionnaire for trust. Questionnaire for Ethical Leadership was adapted from Khan & Javed 2018), the Ethical Leadership Scale-Revised (ESL-R) is a 17-item scale that measures ethical leadership. The Questionnaire for Faculty's Trust was adapted from Hoy & Moran (2003) which is a 31 item Omnibus Trust Scale (OTS) that measures the teacher's trust in their head, colleagues, and clients.

The Ethical Leadership Scale-Revised (ESL-R) of Khan & Javed (2018) is a 17-item scale that measures ethical leadership. During the pretesting of the scale in this study, the Cronbach's coefficient alpha for ethical person was .700, and .710 for ethical leading. The overall Cronbach's coefficient alpha for ethical leadership was found to be in the acceptable overall criterion of .701. The extent of the teacher's answer in ELS-R for every statement was expressed on a 4- point scale. Moreover, the 31 item Omnibus Trust Scale (OTS) of Hoy & Moran (2003) measures the teacher's trust in their head, colleagues, and clients. During the pre-testing of the scale in this study, the Cronbach's coefficient alpha for trust in the campus in charge was .780, for trust in colleagues was .740, and for trust in clients was .71. The overall Cronbach's coefficient alpha for trust in school was .784. The extent of teachers' answers in OTS for every statement was expressed on a 4-point scale.

2.6 Data Gathering Procedure

A letter for approval to conduct this study was sent to the President's Office and the Office of the Director for Satellite Campuses (OSDC) of the Bukidnon State University (BukSU). After the approval, letters of intent were sent out to the respective satellite campuses of BukSU via an email, informing them of the conduct of the study. This was followed by the distribution of the researcher's questionnaire in the target campuses. A letter of consent was also distributed along with the questionnaires and was collected after a week. Since this study was conducted during the pandemic, questionnaires were delivered online via google forms.

After the retrieval of the questionnaires, the questionnaires were sorted and examined. Those with missing values or variables were not included. Data was collected and was analyzed.

2.7 Statistical Treatment

In the analysis of the data, the following statistical tools were employed. To describe the level of ethical leadership and faculty's trust in schools, descriptive statistics using mean and standard deviation were used. Moreover, to determine the significant differences in the perceived ethical leadership and the trust of the faculties when grouped according to profile, a One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was employed. Furthermore, statistical measure using Person r product-moment correlation was utilized to quantify strength as well as the relationship between the perceived ethical leadership and trust in school.

3. RESULTS AND DICUSSIONS

The Table 2 below shows the demographic characteristics of the respondents of the study. Looking at the participant's ages in years in the table below, 41.01% of them were between 26-30 years old, while 30.22% were aged 31-35 hence more than half of them were in their late twenties and middle thirties. Only 9.35% and 15.11% were between 20-25 and 3640 years old, respectively, while the remaining participants were 41 years old above. The data would tell that the faculty's ages were not that too dispersed.

In this study, the male participants were only 14.39% while females were composed of 85.61%. The profile of the participants in terms of gender implies that female respondents were over-presented while male respondents were under-represented. The information gathered would tell that across the campus clusters, the majority of faculty were female.

Table 2. Participant's Profile Frequency and Percentage Distribution

Profile	*N*	%
Age (Years)		
20-25	13	9.35
26-30	57	41.01
31-35	42	30.22
36-40	21	15.11
41-45	3	2.16
46-50	1	0.72

51-Above	2	1.44
Total	139	100
Sex		
Male	20	14.39
Female	119	85.61
Total	139	100
Years of Service		
Below-1	16	11.51
1.1-2	75	53.96
2.1-3	38	27.34
3.1-Above	10	7.19
Total	139	100
Campus Cluster		
North Cluster	42	30.22
South Cluster	43	30.94
Central Cluster	54	38.85
Total	139	100

Examining the participants' profile in terms of years of service, it can be observed that over half of them, or 53.96% had rendered services greater than one year but not more than two years. Also, 11.51% had only rendered their services not greater than one year and 27.34% were already working on the campuses between 2.1 to 3 years, while the minority which was composed of 7.19% had services above 3.1 years. The data would inform this study that there were few new entrant faculty and most of them had only been working recently in the satellite campuses. Likewise, the campus cluster profile shows that the participants in this study were well represented across campuses since 30.22% were from the North Cluster, 30.94% were from the South Cluster, and 38.85% were from the Central Cluster.

To describe faculty' general perception of ethical leadership, mean and standard deviation were utilized and presented in Table 3 below. In terms of Ethical Leadership as an ethical person presented in Table 3 below, the statement, "Listens to what employees have to say" had the highest mean score of 3.69 with a standard deviation of .536. Perhaps, the teachers had observed that their heads solicit ideas from them before arriving at a decision. Since the standard deviation is small, it only shows that most of them have the same perception towards their heads. The statement, "Conducts his/her Personal Life in an ethical manner" had a mean score of 3.28 which is very high with a standard deviation of .723.

This could indicate that the heads also display actions about principles of morality and standards of a profession. The sub-mean means score of 3.31 which is very high with a standard deviation of .341 implies that the faculty perceived their heads as righteous people.

Table 3. Mean and Standard Deviation of the General Perception of the Faculty on Ethical Leadership in terms of Ethical Person

Statements	Mean	SD	Description	Interpretation
Ethical Person				
Listens to what employees have to say.	3.69	0.536	Strongly Agree	Very High
Disciplines employees who violate ethical standards.	3.34	0.665	Strongly Agree	Very High
Conducts his/her personal life ethically.	3.28	0.723	Strongly Agree	Very High
Has the best interests of employees in mind.	3.21	0.654	Agree	High
Makes fair and balanced decisions.	3.27	0.690	Strongly Agree	Very High
Discuss business ethics or values with employees.	3.17	0.691	Agree	High

Sets an example of how to do things the right way in terms of duties.	3.19	0.676	Agree	High
Defines success not just by results but also by the way that they are obtained.	3.28	0.671	Strongly Agree	Very High
When making decisions, asks, "what is the right thing to do?"	3.32	0.639	Strongly Agree	Very High
Sub-Mean	3.31	0.341	Strongly Agree	Very High

Likewise, in terms of ethical leading presented in Table 4 below, the statement "Acknowledge ethically valued behavior of employees" had a mean score of 3.31 which is very high with a standard deviation of .588. This may be a manifestation that the ethical behaviors displayed by the faculty were also recognized and appreciated by the campus heads. It could be that the heads must have given importance to the faculty's honesty, fairness, and equity at work. However, the statement, "His/her actions reflect his/her moral beliefs" had the highest mean score of 3.43 which with a standard deviation of .525. This would tell that the faculty think their heads were very dependable and responsible.

Table 4. Mean and Standard Deviation of the General Perception of the Faculty on Ethical Leadership in terms of Ethical Leading

Statements	Mean	SD	Description	Interpretation
Ethical Leading				
Makes sure that employees are promoted in the organization because they show ethical behavior.	3.27	0.635	Strongly Agree	Very High
Acknowledge ethically valued behavior of employees.	3.31	0.588	Strongly Agree	Very High
Provides rewards to employees for ethically good behavior.	3.32	0.637	Strongly Agree	Very High
His/her decisions have a positive influence on the well-being of the organization and other stakeholders.	3.24	0.575	Agree	High
Can be trusted.	3.36	0.648	Strongly Agree	Very High
Reprimands employees who show ethically flawed behavior.	3.26	0.641	Strongly Agree	Very High
The observation of his/her ethical behaviors inspires employees to resolve ethical problems in principled ways.	3.36	0.577	Strongly Agree	Very High
His/her actions reflect his/her moral beliefs.	3.43	0.525	Strongly Agree	Very High
Sub-Mean	3.32	0.305	Strongly Agree	Very High

On the other hand, the statement "Can be trusted" had a mean score of 3.36 which is very high with a standard deviation of .648 indicating that their agreement on the item was at most the same. Probably, the faculty find their head's leadership as trustworthy. The sub-mean score of 3.32 which is very high with a standard deviation of .305 indicates that the faculty had seen their heads display behaviors comparable to an ethical leader.

Table 5. Overall Mean and Standard Deviation of the General Perception of the Faculty on Ethical Leadership

Ethical Leadership	Mean	SD	Description	Interpretation
Ethical Person	3.31	0.341	Strongly Agree	Very High

Ethical Leading	3.32	0.305	Strongly Agree	Very High
Overall Mean	3.31	0.246	Strongly Agree	Very High

The overall mean score of the faculty's general perception of ethical leadership presented in Table 5 is 3.31 with a standard deviation of .246 which indicates that the faculty thinks their leaders have high ethical beliefs and values. They see them as highly ethical persons who exhibited ethical behaviors and were ethical leaders. The results of the analysis were similar to the research findings of Akker et al. (2009) on ethical leadership of the respondents' leaders. According to the results of their study, a substantial number of respondents stated that their heads demonstrated morality on both private and professional levels. However, more than half of them perceived that the ethical person aspect of ethical leadership does not involve the private conduct of the leader but rather is constrained to the leader being an ethical person insofar as it is related to the position and the context of the organization. Another notable result that conforms in this study was the importance of balancing reward and punishment behaviors of the members of the organization which they see as part of an ethical leader. A large majority of the respondents in their study had observed that their leaders punish members whose acts deviate from organizational values.

In terms of faculty trust in campus in-charge presented in Table 6 below, the statement, "Faculty in this school can trust the head" had a very high mean score of 3.32 with a standard deviation of .514. This shows that the faculty place their trust in the campus in charge. It could be that their heads displayed behaviors and actions worthy of trust. On the other hand, the statement, "The head of this school show concern for the faculty" had a high mean score of 3.20 with a standard deviation of .616. This may be because their campus in charge, does show concern for teachers.

Table 6. Mean and Standard Deviation of the General Trust of the Faculty in School in terms of Trust in Campus in Charge

Statements	Mean	SD	Description	Interpretation
Trust in Campus in Charge				
Faculty in this school can rely on the head.	3.43	0.614	Strongly Agree	Very High
Faculty in this school can trust the head.	3.32	0.514	Strongly Agree	Very High
The head in this school typically acts in the best interests of the faculty.	3.35	0.635	Strongly Agree	Very High
The head of this school show concern for the faculty.	3.20	0.616	Agree	High
The school head does tell the faculty what is going on.	3.29	0.673	Strongly Agree	Very High
The head in this school keeps his or her word.	3.22	0.671	Agree	High
The faculty in this school have faith in the integrity of the head.	3.37	0.605	Strongly Agree	Very High
The faculty in this school trusted most of the head's actions.	3.28	0.578	Strongly Agree	Very High
The head in this school is competent in doing his or her job.	3.37	0.579	Strongly Agree	Very High
The head openly shares personal information with the faculty.	3.25	0.603	Agree	High
Sub-Mean	3.31	0.360	Strongly Agree	Very High

This might be apparent in the way their leaders deal or take interest with the faculty about certain things. The sub-mean score of the campus in charge is 3.31 which is very high with a standard deviation of .360 implying that the faculty trust their heads.

In terms of faculty trust in colleagues presented in Table 7 below, the statement, "Faculty in this school do their job well "had a mean score of 3.26 which is very high with a standard deviation of .456. This establishes that faculties believed their co-faculties were responsible enough to perform the work assigned to them and that they are good at what they do. Also, the statement, "Even in difficult situations, faculty in this school can depend on each other" had a mean score of 3.29 with a standard deviation of .500.

Table 7. Mean and Standard Deviation of the General Trust of the Faculty in School in terms of Trust in Colleagues

Statements	Mean	SD	Description	Interpretation
Trust in Colleagues				
Faculty in this school do their job well.	3.26	0.456	Strongly Agree	Very High
Even in difficult situations, faculty in this school can depend on each other.	3.29	0.500	Strongly Agree	Very High
Faculty in this school are open with each other.	3.31	0.563	Strongly Agree	Very High
When a faculty in this school tell you something, you can believe it is true.	3.22	0.602	Agree	High
Faculty in this school typically look out for each other.	3.31	0.575	Strongly Agree	Very High
Faculty in this school trusted each other.	3.20	0.541	Agree	High
Faculty in this school have faith in the integrity of their colleagues.	3.29	0.500	Strongly Agree	Very High
The faculty in this school are trustworthy.	3.32	0.525	Strongly Agree	Very High
Sub-Mean	3.27	0.315	Strongly Agree	Very High

The above table shows that teachers rely upon and find comfort in each other during challenging periods. This is also evident in the statement, "Faculty in this school are trustful" which had the highest mean score of 3.32 with a standard deviation of .525. It appears that the faculty see their co-workers as trustworthy people and they were not suspicious of them. The sub-mean score of 3.27 which is very high with a standard deviation of .315 shows that the faculty had placed trust in one another.

Table 8. Mean and Standard Deviation of the General Trust of the Faculty in School in terms of Trust in Clients

Statements	Mean	SD	Description	Interpretation
Trust in Clients				
Students in this school are reliable.	3.25	0.615	Agree	High
Students in this school can be counted on to do their work.	3.15	0.601	Agree	High
Faculty think that most of the parents do a good job.	3.20	0.650	Agree	High
Parents in this school are reliable in their commitments.	3.12	0.649	Agree	High
Faculty in this school trusted their students.	3.19	0.701	Agree	High
Students in this school care about each other.	3.17	0.647	Agree	High
Faculty can count on parental support.	3.23	0.663	Agree	High
Students here are communicative.	3.13	0.646	Agree	High
Students in this school do not cheat if they have a chance.	3.01	0.860	Agree	High
Faculty can believe what parents tell them.	3.18	0.640	Agree	High
Faculty in this school believe what students say.	3.19	0.655	Agree	High
The faculty in this school trusted the parents.	3.27	0.597	Strongly Agree	Very High
Faculty here believe that students are competent learners.	3.32	0.605	Strongly Agree	Very High
Sub-Mean	3.19	0.393	Agree	High

In terms of faculty trust in clients presented in Table 9 above, the statement, "Faculty here believe that students are competent learners" had the highest mean score of 3.32 with a standard deviation of .605. This high rating indicates that faculty believed in their students' capability and ability to learn and that they will be able to do something well enough to meet the faculty's standard. Furthermore, this is supported by the statement, "Students in this school can be counted on to do their work" which had a high mean score of 3.15 with a standard deviation of .601. This shows that faculty think their students can be trusted with assigned tasks and bring about expected outcomes. The sub-mean score of 3.19 with a standard deviation of .393 indicates that the faculty had trust in their clients.

The overall mean score of the faculty's general trust in school presented in Table 9 below is 3.25 with a standard deviation of .283 which implies that teachers have a moderately high reliance on the integrity of the school.

Table 9. Overall Mean and Standard Deviation of the General Trust of the Faculty in School

Trust in School	Mean	SD	Description	Interpretation
Trust in Campus in Charge	3.31	0.360	Strongly Agree	Very High
Trust in Colleagues	3.27	0.315	Strongly Agree	Very High
Trust in Clients	3.19	0.393	Agree	High
Overall Mean	3.25	0.283	Agree	High

The result of this study is consistent with the study of Handford, & Leithwood (2013) who found out that the leadership practices which teachers interpret as indicators of competence, consistency and reliability, openness, respect, and integrity are mostly what influenced teachers' trust in school leaders. However, the result is contrary to the study of Balyer (2017) who found out that teachers' perceptions of their trust towards their heads as school leaders are negative. Hence, the lack of trust in the school heads as leaders stems from teachers' experiences and observation. The teachers in their study do not consider their school heads as leaders who have the intellectual capacity and charisma to perform their duty like leading, developing academic standards, inspiring followers, setting the vision, and translating the school mission to staff and students. Likewise, this result is similar to the study of Goddard et al. (2001) whose findings suggest that teacher trust in students and parents makes schools better learning places for students, and could enable and empower fruitful links between families and schools. It appears that trust has a collective effect, hence in schools where there was a greater trust, students' achievement was generally higher.

A series of One-way ANOVA was conducted to determine whether ethical leadership was different when grouped according to the participant's profile. An alpha level of 0.05 was utilized and the data were found to be approximately following the normal distribution. The univariate ANOVAs on the dependent variable revealed a non-significant difference on Sex ((3, 137) = 1.331, p = .251), Age (F(5, 133) = .494, p = .780), and Length of Service (F(3, 135) = .348, p = .791). However, the analysis revealed a statistically significant difference among campus clusters only, (3,126) = 4.437,$p < 0.05$. The medium effect size was noted, $\eta^2 = .29$ indicative of a relatively strong practical significance.

Table 10. Test for Difference in the Ethical Leadership across Faculty's Profile

Variables	Mean	SD	df	F	P-value	$\eta 2$	Decision on Null Hypothesis
Sex							
Male	3.30	0.234	(1, 137)	1.331	0.251	0.01	Failed to Reject
Female	3.37	0.304					
Age (Years)							
20-25	3.36	0.265	(5, 133)	0.494	0.780	0.018	Failed to Reject
26-30	3.30	0.214					
31-35	3.34	0.232					
36-40	3.29	0.325					
41-45	3.19	0.205					
51-Above	3.38	0.537					
Length Service							

Below-1	3.30	0.246					
1.1-2	3.31	0.236	(3, 135)	0.348	0.791	0.008	Failed to Reject
2.1-3	3.31	0.267					
3.1-Above	3.39	0.249					
Campus Cluster							
North	3.40	0.286					
South	3.29	0.245	(2, 136)	4.437	0.014*	0.061	Reject
Central	3.26	0.191					

**Difference is significant at α = .05*

The univariate results in Table 10 above indicate that faculty perception of ethical leadership differed among the campuses. This is probably because the leaders of each school were also different in terms of their background, leadership skills, behavior towards work, subordinates, and clients. Also, this implies that there are certain characteristics of their unique school leaders which may be the reason for their faculty to see them as ethical persons displaying ethical behaviors or otherwise see them as not. The result would somehow suggest that there were some aspects of the leader that do not conform to the ideal ethical leader of the faculty in the school. This effect is not directly explained by univariate test statistics to identify which among the campuses cause this difference, thus, post hoc analysis was employed to determine what group(s) were statistically significantly different from the other on ethical leadership.

The Post Hoc Tukey test revealed that statistically significant differences were noted between North and Central Cluster only, $p < 0.014$. Looking at the mean scores of each campus in terms of perceived ethical leaders displayed in Table 10, it can be observed that the North Cluster obtained the highest mean score of 3.40 with a standard deviation of .286. This suggests that their school leaders acknowledge ethics as an important aspect of their leadership agenda and for them to impart these to their employees, they must make the ethical dimension of their leadership explicit and salient. However, among campuses, the Central Cluster had the lowest mean score of 3.26 with a standard deviation of .191 which reveals that the faculty find it quite challenging to view their leader as possessing the character of an ethical leader.

Therefore, it can be inferred from the variation of the scores among the campuses that ethical leadership is manifested and perceived differently. These variations may be attributed to the teacher's different experiences and observations on their campus leaders' character and management in the school affairs.

Likewise, a series of One-way ANOVA was also conducted to determine whether trust in schools was different when grouped according to the participant's profile, presented in Table 11. An alpha level of .05 was utilized and the data were found to be approximately following the normal distribution. The univariate ANOVAs on the dependent variable revealed a non-significant difference on Sex ((3, 137) = .109, p = .741), Age (F(5, 133) = .541, p = .745), Length of Service (F(3, 135) = 1.993, p = .118) and Campus Cluster (F(2, 136) = 3.031, p = .052). However, a closer examination on the p-value of the campus cluster (p = .052), suggest that it has met the criterion level of the set alpha if rounded up to the nearest two decimal places, hence would entail that it is the only factor among the profile that yields a significant difference.

Table 11. Test for Difference in the Trust in School across Faculty's Profile

Variables	Mean	SD	df	F	Pvalue	$\eta 2$	Decision on Null Hypothesis
Sex							
Male	3.25	0.283	(1, 137)	0.109	0.741	0.001	Failed to Reject
Female	3.23	0.289					
Age (Years)							
20-25	3.29	0.306					
26-30	3.24	0.268					
31-35	3.27	0.292	(5, 133)	0.541	0.745	0.02	Failed to Reject
36-40	3.24	0.309					
41-45	3.27	0.297					

51-Above	2.97	0.092					
Length Service							
Below-1	3.18	0.323					
1.1-2	3.22	0.281	(3, 135)	1.993	0.118	0.042	Failed to Reject
2.1-3	3.31	0.254					
3.1-Above	3.37	0.295					
Campus Cluster							
North	3.28	0.302					
South	3.16	0.254	(2, 136)	3.031	0.052	0.043	Failed to Reject
Central	3.30	0.279					

**Difference is significant at α = .05*

From the univariate result, faculty's level of trust varies among school campuses. This is likely due to the faculty's different experiences with their respective schools. Nevertheless, this effect is not directly explained by univariate test statistics, thus, post hoc analysis was employed to determine what group(s) were statistically significantly different from the other on trust in school.

The Post Hoc Tukey test revealed that statistically significant differences were noted between South and Central Cluster only, $p = 0.053$. Examining the mean score of each cluster, Central Cluster obtained the highest mean score of 3.30 with a standard deviation of .279 which indicates that the faculty see their heads as trustworthy people.

This further suggests that their leader does what is expected of them. The lowest mean score of 3.16 with a standard deviation of .254 can be observed in the South cluster. This result implies that there were some regards of the leaders that do not fit the ideal trustable leader of the school faculty. Additionally, the results suggest that between Central and South Cluster, teachers' trust towards their heads was distinct. It might be that this is due to the leader's behavior and their efforts in maintaining a healthy relationship among teachers.

To determine the relationship between ethical leadership and faculty trust in schools, a series of Person r product-moment correlations were employed and presented in Table 12 below. The degree of relationship was tested at an alpha of 0.05 level of significance. The results shown in the table exhibited a correlation between an ethical person and trust in campus in-charge, and the correlation between ethical leadership and three components (trust in campus in-charge, trust in colleagues, and trust in colleagues) of faculty trust in school obtained p-values less 0.05.

Table 12. Summary of the Relationship between the sub-levels of Ethical Leadership and Trust in School

Variables	Trust in Campus In Charge		Decision on Ho	Trust in Colleagues		Decision on Ho	Trust in Clients		Decision on Ho
	Person r	p-values		Person r	p-values		Person r	p-values	
Ethical Person	.209*	.014	Reject	.034	.695	Failed to Reject	.009	.912	Failed to Reject
Ethical Leading	.292**	.000	Reject	.271**	.001	Reject	.215*	.011	Reject

**Correlation is significant at α = .05*
***Correlation is significant at α = .01*

Consequently, since the p-values are less than the .05 alpha level, therefore there is a positive significant relationship between two subscales of ethical leadership and three components of trust in school. Additionally, this means that there is a small to moderate magnitude of the correlation between the mentioned domains except between ethical persons and two components of trust in school (trust in colleagues and trust in clients). On sub-levels of both the scales, being an ethical leader is somewhat more closely related to faculty trust in campus in-charge compared to being an ethical person. A relatively medium and small effect size, $r^2 = .08$ and $r^2 = .04$ respectively, can be noted between the ethical leader and ethical person, and trust in campus in-charge (Gignac &

Szodorai, 2016). From the effect size result, 8% of the variance in trust in campus in-charge can be explained by an ethical leader while 4% of the variance in trust in campus in-charge can be predicted by an ethical person.

From these results, it is implied that across the campuses, the level of trust that faculty put on their leaders depends on the leader's traits like characterizing honesty and integrity which show an ethical person. Similarly, trust from teachers is established if their leaders as ethical leaders lead by example, exemplify fairness, encourage respect among constituents and decision-making is value-driven. Hence, teachers across schools might have witnessed their leaders characterize the said qualities which perhaps explained the occurrence of a moderate linear relationship. Likewise, being an ethical leader is to some extent associated with teachers' trust towards their colleagues. A typical effect size, $r^2 = .07$ can be observed between ethical leadership and trust in colleagues (Gignac & Szodorai, 2016).

These results would tell that 7% of the variance in trust in colleagues can be explained by ethical leadership. With this, the correlation result of the subscale is somehow not adequate to tell whether ethical leadership can affect teachers' trust in colleagues due to the low practical significance results. Thus, by some means, it is not guaranteed that when leaders across the school are considered ethical leaders, faculty trust in their colleagues would increase. Additionally, being an ethical leader is to some degree associated with teachers' trust towards their clients. A typical effect size, $r^2 = .10$ can be observed between ethical leadership and trust in clients. The mentioned results suggest that 10% of the variance in trust in clients can be explained by ethical leadership. The correlation results indicate that the more the school leaders display ethical leadership behavior, the more it can evoke confidence with the stakeholders, gain and retain their trust, and help in building a good image of the school.

Nevertheless, when ethical leadership as a global scale was correlated to the universal teachers' trust in schools at an alpha of 0.05 level of significance, a p-value of less than 0.05 was obtained (p= .002), presented in Table 13. The significant p-value signifies a positive relationship between the scales. The correlation coefficient of the global scales is 264 which implies a moderate magnitude of correlation. Thus, an increase in ethical leadership has a moderate effect on an increase in faculty trust in schools. The results would further translate that when heads or school leaders among the schools exhibit ethical behavior on their leadership, faculty trust in schools was strengthened. Since the more they see that their leaders demonstrate ethical leadership, the greater is the increase of their trust towards their leaders, colleagues, and clients.

Table 13. Global Scale of the Relationship between Ethical Leadership and Trust in School

Variable	Trust in School		
	Person r	P-values	Decision on Null Hypothesis
Ethical Leadership	.264**	.002	Reject

**Correlation is significant at α = .05*
***Correlation is significant at α = .01*

The effect size (r^2) of the relationship between the global scales in this study is .07. This indicates that 7% of the variance in trust in campuses can be predicted by ethical leadership. Across the schools, faculty might have felt or observed that their leaders were serious in taking their responsibility, keeping promises, caring and emphatic, treating people with genuine affection, and can tolerate and understand that contradiction is part of growth as an organization. Among all the relationships presented, ethical leadership is moderately correlated with trust in the campus in charge. A moderate effect size, $r^2 = .11$ can be noted which implies that 11% of the variance in trust in campus in-charge can be explained by ethical leadership. Thus, the positive relationship would indicate that if the campus in charge demonstrates ethical values as leaders, then faculty will have more confidence to put their trust in them.

The correlation result is parallel to the study of Tschannen-Moran & Gareis (2015) who purported that school leader's values, attitudes, and behaviors have a significant influence on the culture of a school and that it is the principal's responsibility to nurture, build and sustain trusting relationships within the schools. Furthermore, the results of this quantitative study can be supported by Balyer (2017) who concluded that principals who motivate teachers, encourage participation, and make them feel that they are respected tend to trust their leaders. Hence, principals should foster collective vision, model desired and appropriate behaviors, coach faculty to empower their skills to mediate conflicts that may arise in the school.

Congruent results in this study can be observed in Akker et al. (2009) who suggest that the perceptions of the followers on what is an ethical leader plays a significant role in establishing a more trusted relationship between leaders and followers. Their study findings suggest that the congruence of the desired and observed leader behavior influenced the relationship between ethical leader behaviors and trust from its constituents. Also, Brown et al. (2005) found out that ethical leadership is related to consideration behavior, honesty, trust in the leader, and interactional fairness which further supports the results of this study. Hence, an ethical leader creates and establishes trusting relationships among its members (Esmaelzadeh et al., 2017).

4. CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATION

The following are the conclusions based on the findings of the study. In terms of gender, more than half of the participants were female. When it comes to their ages, the majority of them were between 26-40 years old and almost all of them had only been in the service for less than three years. The campus cluster profile had shown that the participants in this study were well distributed and represented across campuses. In general, the faculty perceived their heads or school leaders as ethical people and ethical leaders with very high ethical beliefs and values. The overall faculty trust in their campus in charge, colleagues, and clients range from high to very high, which implies that trust is genuinely present inside the school organization. Moreover, among the factors in the profile, only the campus cluster revealed a statistically significant difference in ethical leadership while non-significant differences in gender, age, and length of service were found during the analysis. The Post Hoc Tukey test revealed that the statistically significant differences were noted between North and Central Cluster only. Furthermore, among the factors in the profile, only the campus cluster revealed a statistically significant difference in trust in schools while non-significant differences in gender, age, and length of service were found during the analysis. The Post Hoc Tukey test revealed that the statistically significant differences were noted between the South and Central Cluster only. Generally, there is a moderate positive magnitude of the correlation between the general perceived ethical leadership and faculty' trust in schools. Thus, an increase in faculty perceived ethical leadership has a moderate effect on the increase of faculty trust in schools.

Based on the findings and conclusions, the following are recommended: It is recommended that for school leaders to be perceived to manifest ethical leadership and increase teachers' trust in schools, several interventions like seminars and ethical leadership training may be provided. Seminars and pieces of training related to ethical leadership and trust, which are to be attended by the respective employees of the organization, can be beneficial for all. The knowledge to be gained will serve as a key tool to develop the performance of the employees as well as the performance of the leader. Another is to emphasize having positive role models in the organization and set organization and personal values. Being a positive role model takes a lot of effort for it to be achieved especially inside the organization. Because subordinates are watching your actions and behaviors all the time, therefore the person must be constantly aware of their responsibilities. A mid-year employee evaluation can be organized as a form of checks and balances inside the organization. This way, it will strengthen the organization's core, which will result in a harmonious workplace. Further exploration to a larger population, like other SUCs, may be conducted for the generalizability of the findings. A lot of data could bring a better output, thus, conducting this type of study to a more population could potentially have a more accurate output. The more data gathered, the stronger the results could be achieved. Altogether, this research opens the scope for examinations of other leadership styles and faculty trust in schools to different populations with different backgrounds, and with approximately equal numbers of males and females' participants. It is important to explore other leadership styles as leadership characteristics vary from person to person. Every head of an organization has a different style of leading their subordinates, making a study about another style could potentially bring a result, which could be beneficial to the entire organization. Moreover, an equal number of a population could also bring a significant effect on the results of this study, thus, conducting this study to an equal number of participants is further recommended.

5. REFERENCES

Akker, L.V., Heres, L., Lasthuizen, K. and Six, F.E. (2009). Ethical Leadership and Trust: It's All about meeting expectations. *International Journal of Leadership Studies, 5*, 102-122. ISSN: 15543145

Allix, N. (2000). Transformational leadership: Democratic or despotic? *Educational Management & Administration*. 2000;28(1):7-20. doi:10.1177/0263211X000281002

Anderson, M. (2017). Transformational Leadership in Education: A review of existing literature. *International Social Science Review*, Vol. 93: Iss. 1, Article 4. https://digitalcommons.northgeorgia.edu/issr/vol93/iss1/4

Andriani, S., Kesumawati, N., & Kristiawan, M. (2018). The influence of transformational leadership and work motivation on teachers' performance. *International Journal of Scientific & Technology Research, 7* (7). ISSN 2277-8616

Balyer, A. (2017). Trust in School Principals: Teachers' Opinions. *Journal of Education and Learning, 6*(2), 317-325.

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. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2005.03.002

Caudle, Airemy Marie (2019). UNT Digital Library. *The Relationship of Five Facets of Teacher Trust in the Principal to Teacher Efficacy*. https://digital.library.unt.edu/ark:/67531/metadc1505247/m1/6 7/

Covey, S. R., & Merrill, R. R. (2006). *The speed of trust: The one thing that changes everything*. 2006. Print

Eranil, A. K. (2017). Relationship between School Principals' Ethical Leadership Behaviours and Positive Climate Practices. *Journal of Education and Learning, 6*(4), 100-112.

Esmaelzadeh, F., Abbaszadeh, A., Borhani, F., & Peyrovi, H. (2017). Ethical leadership and organizational climate: *The experience of Iranian nurses. Iranian Red Crescent Medical Journal, 19*(4). DOI: 10.5812/ircmj.43554.

Gignac, G., Szodorai, E. (2016). Effect size guidelines for individual differences researchers. *Personality and Individual Differences*. Volume 102, pp 74-78. ISSN 0191-8869. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2016.06.069.

Goddard, R. D., Tschannen-Moran, M., & Hoy, W. K. (2001). A multilevel examination of the distribution and effects of teacher trust in students and parents in urban elementary schools. *The elementary school journal, 102*(1), 3-17.

Handford, V., & Leithwood, K. (2013). Why teachers trust school leaders. *Journal of Educational Administration, 51*(2). doi:10.1108/09578231311304706

Hoy, W. K., & Tschannen-Moran, M. (1999). Five faces of trust: An empirical confirmation in urban elementary schools. *Journal of School Leadership*, *9*(3), 184-208. https://doi.org/10.1177/105268469900900301

Ikegbu, E. & Abasi, F. (2017). Utilitarianism as a Veritable Vehicle for the Promotion of a Just Society. *African Journals Online*, Vol. 14 No. 2. https://www.ajol.info/index.php/lwati/article/view/162939

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

Katranci, I., Sungu, H., & Saglam, M. (2015). Teachers' Perceptions about the School Principals' Ethical Leadership Behaviours: A Study from Turkish Vocational High Schools. *Universal Journal of Educational Research, 3*(8), 546-554. DOI:10.13189/ujer.2015.030810

Khan, S. R., & Javed, U. (2018). Revision of Ethical Leadership Scale. *Journal of Research, 12*(2), 121-135.

Khan, S. R., Bauman, D. C., & Javed, U. (2020). A Study on the Effect of Ethical Leadership on Teachers' Moral Motivation at schools in Pakistan. *International Journal of Educational Management*.

MacNeil, A. J., Spuck, D. W., & Ceyanes, J. W. (1998). Developing Trust between Principal and Teachers. *University Council for Educational Administration Convention, St. Louis*.

Maheshwari, V. K. (2017). Vkmaheswari. *Sampling techniques in quantitative research*.

Savulesco, J. et al., (2020). Utilitarianism and the pandemic. *Wiley Online Library*. https://doi.org/10.1111/bioe.12771

Steinmann, B., Nübold, A., & Maier, G. W. (2016). Validation of a German versionof the Ethical Leadership at Work Questionnaire by Kalshoven et al. (2011). Frontiers in psychology, 7, 446.

Tschannen-Moran, M., & Gareis, C. R. (2015). Principals, trust, and cultivating vibrant schools. *Societies, 5*(2), 256-276.