A Linear Structural Relationship of Ethical Leadership and Good Governance

Thanomwan PRASERCHAROENSUK  
thapra@kku.ac.th  
Faculty of Education

Keow Ngang TANG  
tangng@kku.ac.th  
International College

Korakeng KLINTHAISONG  
Faculty of Education  
Khon Kaen University  
Thailand  
Correspondence should be directed to: Keow Ngang, TANG, tangng@kku.ac.th

ABSTRACT
This research aimed to investigate linear structural relationship model of ethical leadership and good governance of administrators under the Secondary Educational Service Area 30, Thailand. Researchers utilized quantitative survey design using questionnaire as instrument. A total of 450 samples including 79 school administrators and 336 teachers were selected from a population of 1,907. Result showed that the linear structural relationship model between ethical leadership and good governance found to be consistent with empirical data, with $\beta = 0.760$, $\chi^2 = 40.220$, df = 29, $\chi^2$/df = 1.387, CFI = 0.998, TLI = 0.995, RMSEA = 0.031, SRMR = 0.016.
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INTRODUCTION
Since the 1997 Financial Crisis, the concept of good corporate governance has gained popularity in Thailand. Good governance means that an organization has efficient, transparent, and auditable management structures and processes in place that promote trust and confidence between stakeholders. These structures and processes also stimulate competitiveness, boost long-term stakeholder value, and present excellent opportunities for sustainable growth. Therefore good governance contributes significantly to an organizational value, stakeholder confidence and overall sustainable growth. The moral and ethics of the society are deteriorating to a critical situation whereby dishonesty and corruptions in the workplace had become a common issue (Government Public Relations Department, 2014). Population growth has brought about competition for limited resources in the society thus people become more attached to materials than goodness. Ethics is a concept about moral values and rules. The school administrators’ ethical leadership is of great importance regarding the educational organizations. The most important responsibility of school administrators is to have an ethical perception of school administration.

Today many professional communities have developed a code of ethics to make more specific the moral code that specifically applies to their situation. Currently, ethical leadership is essential to every organization of all types and in all corners of society. School administrators particularly play a significant role in society as leaders and role models for today’s students but future’s leaders. An ethical leader not only endeavors to do the right things but also to do things right. Therefore school administrator whose behavior is consistent acts morally and he or she values social justice (Glanz, 2006). Ethics is part of the administrators’ job. Indeed, it is an essential part of the job. School administrators have to deal with fairness, equality, justice and democracy as much as they deal with test scores, teachers’ work performance, parents, and budgets (Strike, Emil, Jonas, 2005). School administrators have a key role in managing schools because they are main decision makers, they are school leaders, and they have more responsibilities than the other staffs have. Hence school administrators’ ethical behaviors and decisions directly affect school climate positively. In such an ethical school environment success is a definite success is a definite outcome of the educational process.

In 2003, Thai government issued the Royal decree on Principles and Methods of Good Governance to all governmental organizations. Therefore education reform has to follow the good governance or good administration so as to meet the existing problems and requirements of the globalized world. As a result educational institutions will be expected to be efficient and effective by ensuring the success of management and administration (Runcharoen, 2007).

The past national development in Thailand showed several significant and rapid changes in the local economic, social and political systems, thereby overwhelming the existing management system. The management system evidently was unfit for such changes. Moreover social changes are taking place on the global front as a result of
globalization and the advent of the new economy, thanks to modern information technology and communications, trade liberalization, regionalization, localization, as well as democratic movements and more calls for human rights. These have led to changes in ways of living, values, and culture in the global community. A major objective of the Ninth Plan (Thailand’s National Economic and Social Development Board, NESDB, n.d.), there are six key factors of good governance will be pursued. First is the principle of accountability, which emphasizes recognizing legitimate duties, public awareness, political awareness, and the courage to accept the consequences of actions. Ethic is the second key factor. Attention will be given to righteousness, honesty, diligence, tolerance, and discipline. Popular participation will encourage people from all walks of life to take part in the decision making processes for national development. Fourthly, attention will be given to efficiency, particularly in terms of the optimization and prudent management of limited resources of the country, based on a sustainable development approach. Transparency will provide people with easy access to information, so that they can effectively participate in monitoring the fairness and effectiveness of operations. The Rule of Law will also be important, as laws will need to be continuously updated, to be fair and socially acceptable. The development of good governance in Thai society is seen as a vital condition for success of the Ninth Plan implementation (Thailand’s National Economic and Social Development Board, NESDB, n.d.). It will be a key driving force for all other development strategies. These six key factors, based on the Philosophy of Sufficiency Economy, will become fundamental elements for all levels of management, from the family and community to the government, in order to immediately restore economic and social health and lay down solid foundations for long-term, sustainable economic and social development.

School leaders may often be faced with choices that require them to make decisions. All these decisions may not have any clear cut resolution and are likely to be problematic. That is why school administrators may frequently face with ethical dilemmas. In other word, an ethical dilemma comes out from a situation that requires a choice among competing sets of principles, values, beliefs, perspectives (Cranston, Ehrich, Kimber, 2003). At ethical dilemma is not a choice between wrong and right. It is a choice between two rights as it was stated by Rushworth Kidder (1995 in Ibrahim & Turgut, 2009). For example, deciding whether scarce resources should go to a gifted curriculum or a dropout-prevention program would constitute a dilemma and this is very challenging for school administrators (Lashway, 1996).

Thai educational administration faces the similar problem as they should not seek benefits for themselves and overlook moral and ethics which will lead the organization to sustainable success and growth (Watcharamethee, 2006). As such, school administrators must be knowledgeable, capable, skillful, having expertise, experiences, broad vision, ethics and moral, and are respectful and trustworthy to administer their organizations. Moral and ethics are the major qualities that enhance school administrators to possess the self-ruling, people-ruling, and task-ruling characteristic (Pongsriwat, 2007).

LITERATURE REVIEWS
Michael and Linda (2006) reviewed the emerging construct of ethical leadership and compared this construct with related concepts that share a common concern for a moral dimension of leadership namely spiritual, authentic, and transformational leadership. Drawing broadly from the intersection of the ethics and leadership literatures, Michael and Linda offer propositions about the antecedents and outcomes of ethical leadership. In addition, they also identify issues and questions to be addressed in the future and discuss their implications for research and practice. Their review indicates that ethical leadership remains largely unexplored offering research opportunities for new discoveries and leaders opportunities to improve their effectiveness.

Poohongthong, Surat, and Sutipan (2014) studied on the relationship between ethical leadership, work-life balance, organizational socialization, and organizational citizenship of teachers in Northern Thailand. The results showed that work-life balance and organizational socialization had significant positive correlations with the organizational citizenship behavior (r = 0.187, p < .05 and r = 0.353, p < .01) respectively. Moreover, ethical leadership, work-life balance, and organizational socialization together, could account for 14.3 percent predictive power of teachers’ organizational citizenship behavior. Only organizational socialization had a significant and positive effect on the organizational citizenship behavior (β = 0.378, t = 3.81, p < .01). Thus ethical leadership was proved to be able to strengthen organizational socialization and morality. Consequently, processing of organizational socialization in ethical way will promote being a good citizenship and work effectiveness in the organizations. In short, if employees are happy and success at their work, their work-life balance can be positively and effectively managed as well.

Karakose (2007) carried out a study to determine to what extent principals demonstrate ethical leadership behavior in Turkey. Karakose utilized Ethical Leadership Scale (ELS) developed by Yilmaz (2006) to evaluate
teachers’ perceptions. Findings of Karakose’s study revealed that principals adequately perform their ethical responsibilities like treating their staff justly and encouraging them, being fair, understanding, patient and humble, traits which all exist in the communicative ethics, climate ethics, and ethics in decision making levels at the state high schools in the city of Kutahya, Turkey. Moreover respondents have clearly admitted that their principals engaged in such ethical behavioral ethics level as self-evaluation, not lying and protecting individual rights poorly. Aliyu (2013) overviewed and highlighted the basic concepts and contemporary issues of ethical leadership and good governance. According to Aliyu, leadership is a means of direction, but when it exists without ethics it is absolutely directionless and worthless. Aliyu also seeks to find out the relationship between ethical leadership and good governance, using some selected public and private organizations as case study. On top of that, a conclusion has made that leaders in both public and private sectors should embrace in totality ethics in discharging their responsibilities.

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES
The main objective was to study the linear structural relationship model of the ethical leadership and good governance of the school administrators under the Secondary Educational Service Area 30.

METHOD
Researchers employed survey questionnaire as a method to collect quantitative data. Target group were 1,907 school administrators and teachers who worked in the schools under the Office of Secondary Educational Service Area 30. Multistage sampling technique followed by stratified random sampling technique was administered to select samples according to school size. The required sample size was 415 samples according to Krejcie and Morgan’s Table at 95 percent confident level. These 97 secondary schools consisted of 10 small sized schools, 47 medium sized schools, 17 large sized schools and 23 extra-large sized schools. A total of 415 samples were comprised of 336 teachers and 79 school administrators. Table 1 shows the distribution of samples.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of schools</th>
<th>Administrators</th>
<th>Teachers</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>n</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small size</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium size</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Large size</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>264</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extra-large size</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>97</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>1810</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Rules of thumb for determining adequate sample size (N) are known to be of limited use in achieving an acceptable likelihood for desirable empirical outcomes (e.g., model convergence, statistical precision, statistical power) for a particular application of confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) with real data (Marsh, Hau, Balla, & Grayson, 1998). Common rules of thumb for determining adequate N for a particular application of CFA include, but are not limited to: N ≥ 200, ratio of N to the number of variables in a model (p), N/p ≥ 10; the ratio of N to the number of model parameters (q), N/q ≥ 5; and an inverse relationship between construct reliability and adequate N. Even when model-data assumptions are made that are rarely observed in practice and simulated data are analyzed, the performance of these rules of thumb has limited the ability of methodologists to offer definitive guidelines for adequate N across the myriad of model-data conditions observed in practice (Gagné & Hancock, 2006; Jackson 2001). The core problem with these rules of thumb is that adequate N for CFA depends on many factors that typically vary across any two studies using real data and inexact theoretical models (e.g., distribution of variables, reliability of indicators, size of the model, degree of model misspecification).

Structural Equation Modelling (SEM) is utilized in this study in order to fit the Model. SEM is a combination of factor analysis and regression or path analysis. The interest in SEM is often on theoretical constructs, which are represented by the latent factor. The relationships between the theoretical construct are represented by regression or path coefficients between the factors. The structural equation model implies a structure for the covariance between the observed variables. Nowadays structural equation models need not be linear, and possibilities of SEM extend well beyond the original LISREL program or Mplus program. SEM provides a very general and convenient framework for statistical analysis that includes several traditional multivariate procedures, for example factor analysis, regression analysis, discriminant analysis, and canonical correlation, as special case. Structural equation models are often visualized by a graphical path diagram. The statistical model is usually represented in a set of matrix equation. Mplus which is utilized in this study allows the model to be specified in a
Absolute fit indices determine how well a prior model fits the sample data (McDonald & Ho, 2002) and demonstrates which proposed model has the most superior fit. These measures provide the most fundamental indication of how well the proposed theory fits the data. Unlike incremental fit indices, their calculation does not rely on comparison with a baseline model but is instead a measure of how well the model fits in comparison to no model at all (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 1993). Included in this category are the Chi-Squared test, RMSEA, GFI, AGFI, the RMR and the SRMR. The Chi-Square value is the traditional measure for evaluating overall model fit and, ‘assesses the magnitude of discrepancy between the sample and fitted co-variances matrices’ (Hu and Bentler, 1999: 2). A good model fit would provide an insignificant result at a 0.05 threshold (Barrett, 2007). While the Chi-Squared test retains its popularity as a fit statistic, there exist a number of severe limitations in its use. Firstly, this test assumes multivariate normality and severe deviations from normality may result in model rejections even when the model is properly specified (McIntosh, 2006). Secondly, because the Chi-Square statistic is in essence a statistical significance test it is sensitive to sample size which means that the Chi-Square statistic nearly always rejects the model when large samples are used (Bentler and Bonnet, 1980; Jöreskog and Sörbom, 1993).

On the other hand, where small samples are used, the Chi-Square statistic lacks power and because of this may not discriminate between good fitting models and poor fitting models (Kenny & McCoach, 2003). Due to the restrictiveness of the Model Chi-Square, researchers have sought alternative indices to assess model fit. One example of a statistic that minimizes the impact of sample size on the Model Chi-Square is Wheaton, Muthen, Alwin and Summers’s (1977) relative/normed chi-square ($\chi^2/df$). Although there is no consensus regarding an acceptable ratio for this statistic, recommendations range from as high as 5.0 (Wheaton et al., 1977) to as low as 2.0 (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). The Root Mean Square Error of Approximation (RMSEA) is the second fit statistic reported in the LISREL and Mplus program and was first developed by Steiger and Lind (1980, cited in Steiger, 1990). The RMSEA tells us how well the model, with unknown but optimally chosen parameter estimates would fit the population covariance matrix (Byrne, 1998). Recommendations for RMSEA cut-off points have been reduced considerably in the last fifteen years. Up until the early nineties, an RMSEA in the range of 0.05 to 0.10 was considered an indication of fair fit and values above 0.10 indicated poor fit (MacCallum, Browne, & Sugawara, 1996). It was then thought that an RMSEA of between 0.08 to 0.10 provides a mediocre fit and below 0.08 shows a good fit (MacCallum et al, 1996).

However, more recently, a cut-off value close to .06 (Hu and Bentler, 1999) or a stringent upper limit of 0.07 (Steiger, 2007) seems to be the general consensus amongst authorities in this area. One of the greatest advantages of the RMSEA is its ability for a confidence interval to be calculated around its value (MacCallum et al, 1996). This is possible due to the known distribution values of the statistic and subsequently allows for the null hypothesis (poor fit) to be tested more precisely (McQuitty, 2004). It is generally reported in conjunction with the RMSEA and in a well-fitting model the lower limit is close to 0 while the upper limit should be less than 0.08. The Goodness-of-Fit statistic (GFI) was created by Jöreskog and Sörbom as an alternative to the Chi-Square test and calculates the proportion of variance that is accounted for by the estimated population covariance (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). This statistic ranges from 0 to 1 with larger samples increasing its value. When there are a large number of degrees of freedom in comparison to sample size, the GFI has a downward bias (Sharma, Mukherjee, Kumar, & Dillon, 2005). Related to the GFI is the Adjust Goodness-of-Fit statistic (AGFI) which adjusts the GFI based upon degrees of freedom, with more saturated models reducing fit (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2007). In addition to this, AGFI tends to increase with sample size. As with the GFI, values for the AGFI also range between 0 and 1 and it is generally accepted that values of 0.90 or greater indicate well-fitting models. Given the often detrimental effect of sample size on these two fit indices they are not relied upon as a stand-alone index, however given their historical importance they are often reported in covariance structure analyses.
The Root Mean square Residual (RMR) and the Standardized root mean square residual (SRMR) are the square root of the difference between the residuals of the sample covariance matrix and the hypothesized covariance model. The range of the RMR is calculated based upon the scales of each indicator. The standardized RMR (SRMR) resolves this problem and is therefore much more meaningful to interpret. Values for the SRMR range from zero to 1.0 with well-fitting models obtaining values less than .05 (Byrne, 1998; Diamantopoulos & Siguaw, 2000), however values as high as 0.08 are deemed acceptable (Hu & Bentler, 1999). The Comparative Fit Index (CFI: Bentler, 1990) is introduced by Bentler (1992) and subsequently included as part of the fit indices in his EQS program (Kline, 2005). This statistic assumes that all latent variables are uncorrelated (null/independence model) and compares the sample covariance matrix with this null model. A cut-off criterion of CFI ≥ 0.90 was initially advanced however, recent studies have shown that a value greater than 0.90 is needed in order to ensure that miss-specified models are not accepted (Hu & Bentler, 1999). From this, a value of CFI ≥ 0.95 is presently recognized as indicative of good fit (Hu & Bentler, 1999).

This questionnaire was then sent to a panel of three experts for comments and feedbacks. The panel of experts was selected using the criteria based on their expertise. Validate the quality of the instrument based on the content validity by finding the index of item according to objective congruence (IOC) ≥ 0.6. From the feedbacks returned by the panel, some modifications were made to the original instrument. Pilot testing of the instrument was carried out to 5 school administrators and 25 teachers in the Secondary Educational Service Area Office 25 but they were not the samples of the actual study. They were chosen as their structure and population are the same as the actual study. To improve the quality of the items in the instrument, they were also asked to give suggestions and comments on the items in the instrument. Revisions were made based on the suggestions and feedback from the 30 participants. It could be concluded that the instruments were reliable and good to use as the Cronbach alpha value indicated that all the research variables had higher Cronbach alpha values ranging from 0.992 to 0.991 for ethical leadership and good governance respectively.

RESULTS

Factor loading and validity of observable variables in the relationship model
As indicated in Table 2 below, factor loading values of all ethical leadership attributes ranged from 0.823 to 0.958 are statistically significant at 0.01. Factor loading is the importance of standard factors of each attribute in the relationship model of ethical leadership and good governance of the school administrators that had been taken into consideration. The co-variance with ethical leadership was from 66.70 to 91.80 percent. The attribute with the highest factor loading was fairness. This is followed by responsibility, good citizenship, trust, and caring respectively. The attribute that had the lowest factor loading was respect. As a result all the factors are found to be important construct of ethical leadership. On the other hand, as for constructs of good governance showed the factor loading values from 0.789 to 0.920 and are statistically significant at 0.01. The co-variance with good governance was from 62.20 to 84.60 percent. The attribute with the highest factor loading was participation, followed by responsibility, worthiness, and ethics respectively. The attribute receiving the lowest factor loading was the principle of laws. All constructs were important as the attributes of good governance of the school administrators.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Components of measuring model</th>
<th>β</th>
<th>SE</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>R²</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ETH Trust (TRU)</td>
<td>0.891**</td>
<td>0.023</td>
<td>38.117</td>
<td>0.793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETH Respect (RPC)</td>
<td>0.823**</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>44.044</td>
<td>0.667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETH Responsibility (RPN)</td>
<td>0.928**</td>
<td>0.017</td>
<td>56.150</td>
<td>0.862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETH Fairness (FAI)</td>
<td>0.958**</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>71.028</td>
<td>0.918</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETH Caring (CAR)</td>
<td>0.834**</td>
<td>0.018</td>
<td>45.741</td>
<td>0.695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ETH Citizenship (CIT)</td>
<td>0.908**</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>48.690</td>
<td>0.825</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOV Law (LAW)</td>
<td>0.789**</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>33.191</td>
<td>0.622</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOV Ethics (ETC)</td>
<td>0.834**</td>
<td>0.019</td>
<td>42.892</td>
<td>0.695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOV Transparency (TRA)</td>
<td>0.897**</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>74.987</td>
<td>0.804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOV Participation (PAR)</td>
<td>0.920**</td>
<td>0.010</td>
<td>90.971</td>
<td>0.846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOV Accountability (ACC)</td>
<td>0.897**</td>
<td>0.012</td>
<td>75.840</td>
<td>0.805</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOV Value worthiness (VAL)</td>
<td>0.869**</td>
<td>0.014</td>
<td>60.540</td>
<td>0.756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ethical Leadership (ETH)</td>
<td>0.760**</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>31.951</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**p<.01
Based on Figure 1 below, the correlations between ethical leadership and good governance can be assessed in the standard component score (β) as 0.760 which shows significantly high and positive correlations at 0.01. This means that if ethical leadership is high, good governance value will be high too. Besides, it was found that the relationship model of ethical leadership and good governance has goodness fit with evident data, with $\chi^2 = 40.220$, $df = 29$, $\chi^2/df = 1.387$, CFI = 0.998, TLI = 0.995, RMSEA = 0.031, and SRMR = 0.016 as illustrated in Figure 1. Figure 1 shows the degree of correlation between ethical leadership and good governance can be indicated by standard factor loading $β = 0.760$ which is statistically significant at 0.01. In addition it was found that the relationship model of ethical leadership and good governance agreed with empirical data.

**Figure 1.** Coefficient of standard factor loading of the relationship model

| TRU  | 0.891** |
| RPC  | 0.828** |
| RPN  | 0.760** |
| ETH  | 0.760** |
| GOV  | 0.789** |
| LAW  | 0.844** |
| ETC  | 0.897** |
| TRA  | 0.820** |
| PAR  | 0.897** |
| ACC  | 0.869** |
| VAL  | 0.869** |

$\chi^2 = 40.220$  $df = 29$  $p = 0.08$  $\chi^2/df = 1.387$  CFI = 0.998  TLI = 0.995  RMSEA = 0.031  SRMR = 0.016

**DISCUSSION**

The major focus of this study was on the importance of standard factor loading of each variable in the relationship model of ethical leadership and good governance of the school administrators under the Secondary Educational Service Area 30. Findings revealed that all the attributes of ethical leadership show the factor loading values from 0.823 to 0.958, with statistically significant at 0.01. The co-variance with ethical leadership was from 66.70 to 91.80 percent. This shows that all of the synthesized factors of ethical leadership correlate well with the empirical data with statistical significance (Tuksino, 2009). Hence findings also indicated that all the six attributes of ethical leadership namely fairness, responsibility, citizenship, trust, caring, and respect are important for ethical leadership practiced by school administrators. As a result, finding seems to be in accordance with theories and previous research studies.

On the other hand, all the attributes of good governance had the factor loading values from 0.789 to 0.920, with statistical significance at 0.01 ($p<0.01$). The co-variance with good governance was from 62.20 to 84.60 percent, showing that all of the synthesized factors of good governance correlate very well with the empirical data (Tuksino, 2009). As a result, researchers obtained all the six attributes of good governance namely participation, responsibility, transparency, value worthiness, ethics, and law respectively and considered as important variables of good governance. As a conclusion this finding is in line with concepts, theories and past research works to the attributes of good governance.

The degree of correlation between ethical leadership and good governance was indicated by the standard factor loading ($β = 0.760$), which was high and positive with statistical significance at 0.01. Moreover, it was found that the relationship model of ethical leadership and good governance correlated very well with the empirical data with statistical significance. This shows that the ethical leadership and good governance of the school administrators under the Secondary Educational Service Area 30 correlated in the same direction. If school administrators have high ethical leadership, their good governance degree will be high. Nevertheless finding revealed that this model of relationship between ethical leadership and good governance was found to be consistent with empirical data with $β = 0.760$, $\chi^2 = 40.220$, $df = 29$, $\chi^2/df = 1.387$, CFI = 0.998, TLI = 0.995, RMSEA = 0.031, SRMR = 0.016 as what has been proposed by researchers. As a result, this means that ethical leadership and good governance relationship model may explain the relationship between ethical leadership and good governance.
Result of this study is parallel with the assumption, concepts, theories, and the past research studies. For example, Pawawong, Pamsupawachara and Pengsawat (2012) stated that efficient school administration and their success do not depend on any best theory or principle that can be applied in all schools. However, if school administrators are professional and able to use good governance, knowledge, and expertise in integrating various techniques, theories and principles as appropriate to situations, places, time, and the environmental factors; then they will be successful and efficient. Another study which was conducted by Wachiramethee (2009) found that ethical leadership of school administrators is important since it will link towards ethics in the institution and a good example for teachers, students, and educators. It will bring about good culture and moral which lead to happiness of people in the society and hence the expectation of the Education Act will be met. The finding also agrees with the research work of Okechukwu (2012), who studied ethical leadership and good governance in a local government in Nigeria and found that the potential pattern of ethical leadership would help control the situations in developing socio-economic resources in Nigeria, and will improve the quality of administration. Similarly, Othman (2014), conducted a study on characteristics of leaders with good governance, using businessmen in Malaysia as the sample group. This study shows that ethical leadership is necessary for organizational good governance.

CONCLUSION
This study found to have the above mentioned attributes of ethical leadership supported the proposition that ethical leadership associated with good governance practices. Ethical leadership attributes emerged as supporting the process of good governance practices in the context of this study. The overall findings of this study are useful for the policy maker, educational administrators, educators and practitioners. Empirical development in the school organizations largely neglects to recognize ethics as an element of good governance. This study provides empirical justification that ethics particularly ethical leadership is crucial in the construction of good governance practices. Such findings establish school organization as a social process rather than as economic logic. The richness and justification of data reveals its valuable contribution of knowledge from an academic perspective. This study also contributes to the work of school administrators in several ways. The findings highlighted the important of ethics, and thus acknowledge the managerial implications of incorporating ethical based governance into the educational administration system. There were several limitations noted. The general limitation is the scope of the study. As ethics is a sensitive issue, an in depth description of practice, through case research, was impossible. However, in order to enrich the findings, a case study as well as comparative study would be recommended for future research. Researchers would like to recommend an objective view of the research that would provide a causal effect of the attributes of ethical leadership and good governance practices. In addition, researchers predict future research could build an insight into explaining the relationship between ethical leadership and good governance.
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