Elaborating the Employees' Evaluation of Their Leaders Based on Gender, Experience, and Education

Taylan Budur[1]
Business and Management Department, Tishk International University, Sulaymaniyah, Iraq
Email: taylan.budur@ishik.edu.iq

Cemil Top[2]
Tishk International University, Erbil, Iraq
Email: cemil.top@ishik.edu.iq

Osman Durmaz[3]
Tishk International University, Erbil, Iraq

Dr. Ahmet Demir[4]
Business and Management Department, Tishk International University, Sulaymaniyah, Iraq
Email: ahmet.demir@ishik.edu.iq

Abstract

Aim of this study is to elaborate how differently the employees evaluate their leaders' virtues based on employees' gender (G), experience (E), and education (ED) in different organizations in Sulaimani city of Kurdistan region of Iraq. Data are collected through survey questionnaire from 408 employees and managers of the companies, which operate in Kurdistan Region of Iraq. Further, the data was evaluated utilizing IBM SPSS 24 independent samples t test and ANOVA analysis. The results showed that there is no G difference in evaluation of leader's morale, knowledge, and attitude while experience and education does partially.

Keywords: Leadership virtues, G effect, Ethical leadership, Morale of a leader, Knowledge of a leader, Attitude of a leader

Introduction

It is widely mentioned that importance of anything could be understood with its opposite. And many scholars have expressed that ethics importance in the workplace have been recognized through unethical scandals in the organizations. Ethics provide one to select between good or bad. Further, ethics in business ensure organizations to have equal treatment, fair decisions, and balance activities for both employees and customers (Trevino, 2006).

Drawing on these, ethical leaders are crucial factor to imply ethical conduct in the workplace to provide justice and fairness for the workplace. There are enough evidences that ethical leadership foster job satisfaction and performance in the organizations. According to Neubert et al. (2009) ethical leadership positively affects employee's affective commitment and job satisfaction over creating ethical climate in the workplace. Similarly, Celik (2015) found that ethical leadership has positive effect on organizational commitment and job satisfaction.

On the other hand, leaders' attitudes and behaviors are one of the most influential factors on the internal effectiveness and success of the organization (Zaim et al., 2013). This internal effectiveness could be defined as increased performance of the employees, which in turn creates an external success for the customer orientation of subordinates.

Further, diverse workforces are an important factor for the long-term success of the organizations namely; for problem solving, effective decision making, and having different alternatives for operation management (Kılıç and Kuzey, 2016). Further, Kilic and Kuzey noted that majority of the board of companies they investigated are male dominated, and among these board executives' female managers are positively considered with the firm's financial performance. As scholars asserted

transformational leaders are more influential on employees' outcomes and organizational effectiveness, and female leaders are tended to represent transformational leadership behaviors more than males (Rosener, 1990), but there is lack of women leaders in the executive positions, because of different factors (like employees perceptions that women are more sensible against problems, lack of trust in female managers, and similar stereotypes) in the organizations (Pounder and Coleman, 2002).

Furthermore, Card (1999) noted ED level is an important factor for the labor market and has a positive effect on the earnings of the individuals. Similarly, Dee (2004) asserted ED provides individual enhanced awareness, participation and civic knowledge. Additionally, Luo and Chen (2018) revealed that ED decrease the gap between genders. They put forward when genders become same level of ED, they can express equal knowledge in the society.

Moreover, E is a key factor on group or team performance. Fiedler et al. (1989) noted there is a positive correlation between E and team performance when stress is high. Nichols (2016) revealed that E affects leaders leadership behaviors positively. According to him, managers previous jobs are an important determinant for individual's future performance. Similarly, Kragt and Guenter (2018) asserted that leaders E is positively associated with h/is motivational behaviors and job effectiveness. In addition, they noted experienced leaders are more positive for new skills and trainings in the organizations.

In this respect, the current study aims to investigate firstly, how employees evaluate knowledge (K), attitude (A) and moral (M) of ethical leader in different organizations in Sulaimania city. And the second aim of the study is to examine the perception differences of employees according to G, E and ED among small enterprises in the region. In current literature, there isn't similar study, which evaluates these dimensions according to demographical features of employees.

Literature Review

Ethical Leadership

Ethical leadership concept improved through the ethical conducts of transformational leaders in the workplace (Brown et al., 2005). Trevino, Hartman, and Brown (2000) expressed the importance of honesty, humility and tolerance for the ethical leaders. According to Gini (1998) ethical leaders provide discipline through reward and punishment to encourage subordinates for ethical standards in the workplace. Further, Brown and Trevino (2006) asserted moral leaders try to affect ethical and unethical behaviors through their proactive personality. These leaders are not only symbol of their rules, in the same time they are the role models of the ethical characteristics in the organization (Brown and Trevino, 2006).

Hitt, 1990 revealed that leadership cannot be thought without ethical values. He put forward in order to imply ethical conduct in the organization, leaders should understand the importance of ethics, they must be role model for ethical decisions and must have a plan to promote ethical conduct in the work place. According to Brown et al., (2005) based on the social learning theory (Bandura, 1977) leaders' attitudes, behaviors and values could be imitated and spread in the organization. As mentioned before, to have this ethical atmosphere leaders have to be role model in the organization instead of being only preacher (Dinc & Nurovic, 2016). And they defined ethical leadership as "*the demonstration of normatively appropriate conduct through personal actions and interpersonal relationships, and the promotion of such conduct to followers through two-way communication, reinforcement, and decision-making"* (Brown et al., 2005)

According to aforementioned definitions, it can be found out that ethical leadership has three sides. In one side, leaders are going to be role model as the source of ethical climate, on the other side, they are going to encourage subordinates with rewards and punishments to follow these ethical rules, and finally they consult subordinates to make ethical decisions in the organizations (Benevene et al., 2018; Brown et al., 2005). Pursuing this further Flynn, 2008 noted ethical leaders are the virtues agent encourage ethical climate for the balance conduct in the organization.

Drawing on the current literature, Trevino et al. (2000) noted honesty, humility and tolerance are mainly important values for ethical leaders. Hood, 2003 investigated four main types of values for transformational, transactional and laissez faire leaders, which are: morality-based values (forgiveness, politeness, helpfulness, affection, and responsibility); social values (freedom, equality, and world at peace); personal values (honesty, self-respect, courage, and broadmindedness); and competency-based values (logic and competence). And he concluded that those values positively related to transformational and transactional leadership styles. Budur, 2018 examined the effects of moral virtues namely justice, wisdom, courage, and temperance on ethical leaders, commitment and performance. And he found that leaders' religiosity positively and significantly associated with employee's commitment and performance. Further, Kalshoven and Den Hartog, 2009 asserted fairness, power sharing, role clarification and trust are influential behaviors of ethical leaders for their effectiveness in the organization.

Further, Draganidis and Mentzas (2006) noted K, behaviors and skills of individuals foster his/her performance in the work place. Ismail Al-Alawi (2007) defined K, as the combination of values, experiences and information of individual. Knowledge is an important factor for gaining competitive advantage and a crucial indicator for sustainable development of a learning organization (Bierly et al., 2000; Zaim et al., 2013). Bierly and his associates noted, better information and knowledge promotes the success level of the business. In this paper, knowledge represents the leader's capability to make decisions, effective communication and using of experience and information timely.

3. Methodology

The study aims to elaborate the evaluate the ethical leadership dimensions for corporations based on employees' perceptions about their leaders. There are mainly two questions are answered in this research; 1- Is there a G difference in evaluation of leadership dimensions? And 2- Does the evaluation of these dimension change based on the experience, ED, and position? To answer these questions, we have developed a survey questionnaire which contain 28 questions about ethical leadership. Those questions have been designed as twelve questions represent morale of a leader such as justice, honesty, and courage, nine questions represent vision and knowledge a leader, and finally, seven questions represent attitude of a leader such as kindness and humbleness.

The prepared questionnaire has been conducted to 408 employees from various education, trade, and service companies. The selection of the employees have been based on convenient random sampling. The employees have been selected among who have direct superior to evaluate.

To proceed analysis of the data, initially reliability analysis of the data have been conducted. Secondly, Variance analysis (ANOVA) have been proposed in order to elaborate morale, knowledge, and attitude of leaders based on ED and position of employees while independent samples t test has been proposed to elaborate the differences between genders. The hypothesis of this research can be sequenced as;

H1a: There is a significant difference between employees' G and evaluation of M of a leader.

H1b: There is a significant difference between employees' G and evaluation of K of a leader

H1c: There is a significant difference between employees' G and evaluation of A of a leader

H2a: There is a significant difference between employees' E and evaluation of M of a leader

H2b: There is a significant difference between employees' E and evaluation of K of a leader

H2c: There is a significant difference between employees' E and evaluation of A of a leader

H3a: There is a significant difference between employees' ED level and evaluation of M of a leader

H3b: There is a significant difference between employees' ED level and evaluation of K of a leader

H3c: There is a significant difference between employees' ED level and evaluation of A of a leader

4. Data analysis and findings

4.1. Reliability

In this section, we have initially tested the reliability of each dimension in ethical leadership questionnaire. To do this, we have used the Cronbach's Alpha that must be minimum 0.7 (Demir & Eray, 2015; Demir, Eray & Erguvan, 2015). The Table 1 below shows the details.

Table 5 Reliability Analysis

	Mean	Std. Deviation	N	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted	Cronbach's Alpha of Dimension
M								
Q1	3.735	.9906	408	42.509	58.791	.651	.891	
Q2	3.794	1.0167	408	42.451	57.831	.698	.888	
Q3	3.813	.9506	408	42.431	59.170	.655	.891	
Q4	3.760	.9618	408	42.485	59.404	.629	.892	
Q5	3.836	1.0468	408	42.409	58.571	.624	.892	
Q6	3.620	1.0111	408	42.625	59.370	.595	.894	**0.900**
Q7	3.728	.9799	408	42.517	60.266	.554	.896	
Q8	4.032	1.0776	408	42.213	58.370	.615	.893	
Q9	4.032	1.0214	408	42.213	58.218	.667	.890	
Q10	3.980	1.0537	408	42.264	58.794	.604	.893	
Q11	3.951	.9777	408	42.294	59.318	.623	.892	
Q12	3.963	.9845	408	42.281	60.651	.524	.897	
K								
Q13	3.956	1.0245	408	25.928	27.176	.472	.841	**0.846**
Q14	3.830	1.0126	408	26.053	26.632	.537	.833	

Q16	3.623	1.1367	408	26.261	25.934	.522	.836	
Q17	3.716	1.0758	408	26.168	25.766	.581	.828	
Q18	3.583	1.0458	408	26.300	25.346	.649	.819	
Q19	3.639	1.0084	408	26.245	25.683	.643	.821	
Q20	3.745	1.0031	408	26.138	25.745	.641	.821	
Q21	3.792	.9979	408	26.092	25.989	.618	.824	
A								
Q22	3.929	1.0409	408	22.588	27.520	.679	.881	
Q23	3.824	1.1009	408	22.694	26.542	.729	.875	
Q24	3.770	1.0931	408	22.748	26.602	.730	.875	
Q25	3.814	1.1431	408	22.703	25.998	.748	.872	**0.894**
Q26	3.792	1.1382	408	22.725	26.126	.739	.873	
Q27	3.679	1.1248	408	22.838	27.364	.628	.887	
Q28	3.711	1.0253	408	22.806	28.378	.604	.889	

Given Table 2, It can be observed that Cronbach's Alpha levels of all dimensions as morale (0.900), knowledge (0.846), and attitude (0.894) are above the threshold which has been considered as 0.07 by researchers (Demir & Mukhlis, 2017; Demir & Aydinli, 2016). Beside this, none of the items can increase the Cronbach's Alpha in case it is deleted. This shows that the concerning Cronbach's Alpha level is the peak of the concerning group of questions. Furthermore, standard deviations of the questionnaire seem to be stable around one. Item total correlation for items in morale was minimum 0.524 and maximum 0.698, in knowledge dimension it was minimum 0.472 and maximum 0.643, in attitude dimension it was minimum 0.604 and maximum 0.748. It can be revealed from these results that there is no risk for multicollinearity due to there has been no items that is having correlation above 0.9. The results show that the concerning constructs are reliable to conduct ANOVA analysis.

4.2. Gender Difference

In this section, we have conducted ANOVA in order to understand the differences and similarities among evaluations of employees based on their G, experience, and ED. Table 2 below shows the results about evaluations of male and female employees.

Table 6 Independent Samples T test

Group Statistics					
Gender		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
M	Males	233	3.8565	.70083	.04591

	Females	174	3.8467	.69101	.05239
K	Males	233	3.7145	.75176	.04925
	Females	174	3.7612	.68048	.05159
A	Males	233	3.8087	.86390	.05660
	Females	174	3.7570	.85137	.06454

Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means			
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference
M	Equal variances assumed	.407	.524	.140	405	.889	.00977
	Equal variances not assumed			.140	375.597	.889	.00977
K	Equal variances assumed	.950	.330	-.646	405	.519	-.04673
	Equal variances not assumed			-.655	390.298	.513	-.04673
A	Equal variances assumed	.377	.540	.601	405	.548	.05173
	Equal variances not assumed			.603	375.694	.547	.05173

Given in the Table 3, it can be observed from the group statistics that average of males' evaluation on morale was (3.86) a little bit above than average of the females (3.85). Further, evaluating the knowledge and vision of a leader, average of females (3.76) were above the average of males (3.72). Finally, in evaluation of attitude of a leader, average of males (3.81) have been above the average of females (3.75). Beside these, independent sample test statistics in the same table shows that these differences have been significant. As a result, it can be said that G difference doesn't affect the evaluation of morale, knowledge, and attitude virtues of leaders.

4.3. Experience Difference

In this section, one-way ANOVA test has been proposed to elaborate the evaluation differences among employees based on their experiences in their fields. The Table 3 shows the details.

Table 7 ANOVA based on experiences of employees

	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error

icabep@ishik.edu.iq

M	Less Than One Year	15	3.3500	.64488	.16651
	1-5 Years	154	3.8706	.63836	.05144
	6-10 Years	128	3.9023	.71481	.06318
	11-15 Years	87	3.8793	.70879	.07599
	More Than 15 Years	24	3.7083	.83152	.16973
	Total	408	3.8537	.69552	.03443
K	Less Than One Year	15	3.5250	.53075	.13704
	1-5 Years	154	3.7484	.71286	.05744
	6-10 Years	128	3.7680	.69027	.06101
	11-15 Years	87	3.7529	.76889	.08243
	More Than 15 Years	24	3.5469	.85562	.17465
	Total	408	3.7354	.72103	.03570
A	Less Than One Year	15	3.2381	.72173	.18635
	1-5 Years	154	3.7375	.93077	.07500
	6-10 Years	128	3.9096	.80770	.07139
	11-15 Years	87	3.8539	.78578	.08424
	More Than 15 Years	24	3.5714	.81032	.16540
	Total	408	3.7882	.85743	.04245

Given in the Table above, we can observe the evaluations of employees on their leaders' morale, knowledge, and attitude based on employees' experiences. The E of employees are separated as less than one year up to more than 15 years. Evaluating morale of a leader, it was observed that once the E becomes less, evaluations of employees reduces. For example, average of employees who have E less than one year (3.35) is less than average of employees who have E between 1-5 years. Further, evaluation average of employees who have E between 6-10 years (3.87) have observed to be above the employees who have E between 1-5 years.

Table 8 ANOVA significance based on experiences of employees

Dependent Variable			Mean Difference (I-J)	Std. Error	Sig.
M	Less Than One Year	1-5 Years	-.52057[*]	.18678	.044
		6-10 Years	-.55234[*]	.18845	.029

11-15 Years	-.52931*	.19306	.049
More Than 15 Years	-.35833	.22728	.513

Given in the Table 5, it can be revealed that only less than one-year experienced employees have evaluated their leaders' morale significantly less than employees who have E between 1-5 years (P=0.044), 6-10 years (P=0.029), and 11-15 years (P=0.049). However, there is no significant difference (P>0.05) between evaluation of employees who have E less than one year and employees who have more than 15 years.

When the differences between employees who have E 1-5 years and 6-10 years, 6-10 years and 11-15 years, 11-15 years and more than 15 years there hasn't been observed any significant difference (P>0.05). As results of those analysis, it can be concluded that although it shows that while the E decreases the evaluation of morale also decreases, there are significant differences only between employees who have E less than one year and employees who have E from one year up to 15 years. So that Hypothesis has been accepted partially.

Secondly, employees' evaluation of their leaders on knowledge based on employees' E have been tested. It has been observed that although average of evaluation increases as E increases, those differences haven't been significant but coincidental (P>0.05).

Third, we have tested the differences among variously experienced employees on their evaluation of leaders' attitudes. The results show that employees, who have E less than one year, have evaluated their leaders' attitudes significantly less than more experienced employees. For example, the difference was significant between employees who have less E than one year and the ones between 1-5 years (P=0.032). Moreover, the difference between employees who have E less than one year and 6-10 years was also significant (P=0.44). Beside this, above one-year E, there is no significant (P>0.05) difference in evaluation on their leaders' attitudes. As result, the hypothesis partially supported.

4.4. Education difference

In this section, we have proposed ANOVA test in order to elaborate the differences of employees on their evaluation of leaders' morale, knowledge, and attitude. Table 6 shows further details.

Table 9 ANOVA based on ED levels of employees

Descriptive					
		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error
M	High School	2	3.0000	0.00000	0.00000
	Vocational School	16	3.1250	.72521	.18130
	Bachelor's degree	289	3.8477	.69969	.04116
	Masters or PhD	100	4.0000	.60022	.06002
	Total	407	3.8525	.69597	.03450

K	High School	2	2.6250	.88388	.62500
	Vocational School	16	3.1328	.61487	.15372
	Bachelor's degree	289	3.7554	.72629	.04272
	Masters or PhD	100	3.7938	.66983	.06698
	Total	407	3.7348	.72180	.03578
A	High School	2	3.2143	.10102	.07143
	Vocational School	16	3.1250	.65543	.16386
	Bachelor's degree	289	3.7632	.89496	.05264
	Masters or PhD	100	3.9686	.71142	.07114
	Total	407	3.7859	.85725	.04249

Given in the Table 6, it can be observed that averages on evaluating the leaders' morale, knowledge and attitude show increase positively with the increase of ED level. For example, high school graduates evaluated morale as 3.0 while vocational school graduates did 3.12, bachelor's degree holders did 3.84, and masters or PhD holders did 4.0. Beside this, the difference between high school degree holders and other ED level graduates weren't significant (P>0.05). Vocational school graduates have significantly less evaluated their leader's morale than both bachelor's (P= 0.001) and masters or PhD degree holders (P=0.001). Finally, there is no significant difference (P>0.05) in evaluating the leader's morale between bachelor's degree and master or PhD degree holders.

Secondly, the same positive relation seems in evaluation of knowledge of leaders. As well as the ED level increases, the employees have evaluated their leader's knowledge level positively. Beside this, there is no significance (P>0.05) in this evaluation between high school and vocational school graduates and high school bachelor's degree. The employees, who have vocational school diploma, have evaluated their leaders' knowledge significantly less than bachelor's degree (P=0.004) and masters or PhD degree holders (P=0.003). However, the difference wasn't significant (P>0.05) between bachelor's degree and masters or PhD degree holder employees.

Thirdly, evaluating the attitude, vocational schools' graduates have significantly evaluated the attitude of a leader than bachelor's degree (P=0.018) and masters or PhD degree holders (0.001). Further, it was seen that there is a significant difference in evaluation of leader's attitude between bachelor's degree and masters or PhD degree holders (P=0.05). However, it was seen that masters or PhD degree holders evaluate attitude of a leader more optimistically than bachelor's degree holders.

Given in the data analysis section, the results reveal that H1a, H1b, H1c, and H2b have been rejected while H2a, H2c, H3a, H3b, and H3c have been partially accepted.

5. Conclusions

The main purpose of this research was to understand whether employees differ in evaluating the morale, knowledge, and attitudinal virtues of their leaders based on employees' G, E, and educational background.

The results have shown that based on G, there is no difference whether being male or female make sense in evaluating the leaders three virtues. The reason behind this might be because both genders perceive equally in sense of leadership virtues.

Secondly, it has been observed that E partially make sense in evaluating the leader's morale, knowledge, and attitude. Furthermore, it can be partially said that while E at a job effects evaluating those virtues or perception of those three virtues positively. Specifically, at least one-year E make significant sense in perceptions about a leader. The reason behind this might be less experienced people are more sensitive in giving positive points to their leaders at the beginning.

Finally, it has been seen that ED level changes the perceptions about a leader partially significantly. Moreover, it has been partially seen that higher ED level evaluates the leader's virtues more positively than lower ED levels. The reason behind this might be that as long as the ED level increases, employees become more tolerant to their leaders and as result they evaluate their leaders more positively than less educated employees.

References:

Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological review*, *84*(2), 191.

Benevene, P., Dal Corso, L., De Carlo, A., Falco, A., Carluccio, F., & Vecina, M. L. (2018). Ethical Leadership as Antecedent of Job Satisfaction, Affective Organizational Commitment and Intention to Stay Among Volunteers of Non-profit Organizations. *Frontiers in psychology*, *9*.

Bierly III, P. E., Kessler, E. H., & Christensen, E. W. (2000). Organizational learning, knowledge and wisdom. *Journal of organizational change management*, *13*(6), 595-618.

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

Brown, M. E., Treviño, L. K., & Harrison, D. A. (2005). Ethical leadership: A social learning perspective for construct development and testing. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes*, *97*(2), 117-134.

Budur, T. The Impact of Al-Ghazali's Virtues on Organizational Commitment and Performance: A Case Study at Private Education Institutions in Kurdistan Region of Iraq.

Card, D. (1999). The causal effect of education on earnings. In *Handbook of labor economics* (Vol. 3, pp. 1801-1863). Elsevier.

Çelik, S., Dedeoğlu, B. B., & Inanir, A. (2015). Relationship Between Ethical Leadership, Organizational Commitment and Job Satisfaction at Hotel Organizations. *Ege Academic Review*, *15*(1).

Dee, T. S. (2004). Are there civic returns to education? *Journal of public economics*, *88*(9-10), 1697-1720.

Demir, A., & Eray, O. (2015). Effect of Non-Technical Dimensions of Service Quality on "Satisfaction","Loyalty", and "Willingness to Pay More" of the Customers: the Case of Georgian Internet Service Providing Companies. *Journal of Research in Business, Economics and Management*, *5*(1), 500-508.

Demir, A., Eray, O., & Erguvan, M. M. (2015). How non-technical dimensions of service quality effects satisfaction and loyalty of costomers at gsm service sector in Georgia. *International Journal of Engineering Technology and Scientific Innovation*, *1*(02), 150-162.

Demir, A., & Mukhlis, M. (2017). An evaluation of gated communities as a product: An empirical study in Sulaimaniyah, Iraq. *Theoretical and Empirical Researches in Urban Management*, *12*(3), 63-85.

Demir, A., & Aydinli, C. (2016). Exploring the Quality Dimensions of Mobile Instant Messaging Applications and Effects of Them on Customer Satisfaction. *International Journal of Computer Theory and Applications*, *9*(22), 1-15.

Demirtas, O., & Akdogan, A. A. (2015). The effect of ethical leadership behavior on ethical climate, turnover intention, and affective commitment. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *130*(1), 59-67.

Dinc, M. S., & Nurovic, E. (2016). The impact of ethical leadership on employee attitudes in manufacturing companies. *Nile Journal of Business and Economics*, *2*(3), 3-14.

Draganidis, F., & Mentzas, G. (2006). Competency based management: a review of systems and approaches. *Information management & computer security*, *14*(1), 51-64.

Fiedler, F. E., McGuire, M., & Richardson, M. (1989). The role of intelligence and experience in successful group performance. *Journal of Applied Sport Psychology*, *1*(2), 132-149.

Flynn, G. (2008). The virtuous manager: A vision for leadership in business. In *Leadership and business ethics* (pp. 39-56). Springer, Dordrecht.

Gini, A. (1997). Moral leadership and business ethics. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, *4*(4), 64-81.

Hitt, W. D. (1990). Ethics and Leadership: Putting Theory into Practices (Battelle Memorial Institute, Columbus). *Google Scholar*.

Hood, J. N. (2003). The relationship of leadership style and CEO values to ethical practices in organizations. *Journal of Business ethics*, *43*(4), 263-273.

Ismail Al-Alawi, A., Yousif Al-Marzooqi, N., & Fraidoon Mohammed, Y. (2007). Organizational culture and knowledge sharing: critical success factors. *Journal of knowledge management*, *11*(2), 22-42.

Kalshoven, K., & Den Hartog, D. N. (2009). Ethical leader behavior and leader effectiveness: The role of prototypicality and trust. International Journal of Leadership Studies, 5(2), 102-120.

Kılıç, M., & Kuzey, C. (2016). The effect of board gender diversity on firm performance: evidence from Turkey. *Gender in Management: An International Journal*, *31*(7), 434-455.

Kragt, D., & Guenter, H. (2018). Why and when leadership training predicts effectiveness: The role of leader identity and leadership experience. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *39*(3), 406-418.

Luo, Y. H., & Chen, K. H. (2018). Education expansion and its effects on gender gaps in educational attainment and political knowledge in Taiwan from 1992 to 2012. *International Journal of Educational Development*, *60*, 88-99.

Neubert, M. J., Carlson, D. S., Kacmar, K. M., Roberts, J. A., & Chonko, L. B. (2009). The virtuous influence of ethical leadership behavior: Evidence from the field. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *90*(2), 157-170.

Nichols, A. L. (2016). What do people desire in their leaders? The effect of leadership experience on desired leadership traits. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *37*(5), 658-671.

Pounder, J. S., & Coleman, M. (2002). Women–better leaders than men? In general, and educational management, it still "all depends". *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *23*(3), 122-133.

Rosener, J. B. (2011). Ways women lead. In *Leadership, Gender, and Organization* (pp. 19-29). Springer, Dordrecht.

Zaim, H., Yaşar, M. F., & Ünal, Ö. F. (2013). Analyzing the effects of individual competencies on performance: A field study in services industries in Turkey. *Journal of Global Strategic Management*, *7*(2), 67-77.