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Abstract

This research investigated the interplay between perceptions of HRM and ethical leadership, and the trickle-down effect of this interplay on perceptions of collective efficacy and team-oriented commitment. A positive relationship between ethical leadership and collective efficacy beliefs was expected, drawing from the Social Learning Theory (SLT). Besides, using the Social Exchange Theory (SET), a positive relationship between ethical leadership and perceptions of team-oriented commitment was predicted. Both relationships were not supported by the data. The mediating role of ethical leadership was tested as well. Following the line of reasoning in the SLT, a trickle-down effect from perceptions of HRM to collective efficacy through ethical leadership was expected. Additionally, a trickle-down effect from perceptions of HRM to team-oriented commitment through ethical leadership was predicted based on the principles of the SET. Concerning both hypotheses, data did not support this mediating role of ethical leadership. Implications of this research and directions for future research are included.
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1. Introduction

Nelson Mandela once said that ‘it is better to lead from behind and to put others in front, especially when you celebrate victory when nice things occur. You take the front line when there is danger. Then people will appreciate your leadership’. This is only one of the many inspiring quotes about leadership. The quote states that the appreciation of one’s leadership depends upon the position a leader takes in different situations. Additionally, it implies that being the leader is not equal to consistently being in front, but to provide your followers with the opportunity to be in front as well. From the literature on leadership can be concluded that this quote could fit an ethical leader. Honesty, fairness and thoughtfulness are some aspects that characterize an ethical leader (Brown & Treviño, 2006). Besides, an ethical leader will provide its followers with the opportunity to be involved in the decision-making, through two-way communication (Brown, Treviño & Harrison, 2005). This implies that followers will be able to be at the forefront. Ethical leadership is embedded in both transformational leadership and transactional leadership. A transformational leader is able to energize followers and to express trust in their abilities (Bass & Avolio, 2000). Transactional leadership can be seen as a style contrasting transformational leadership (Hartog, Muijen, & Koopman, 1997). According to Bass (1991) the relationship between transactional leaders and their followers is similar to a transaction. The leader explains what is expected and in what way fulfilling the goals will be rewarded. The distinction between transformational and transactional leadership is the most commonly made distinction in the leadership literature. However, since the beginning of this century the demand for ethical guidance has risen due to the increase in ethical scandals (Brown & Treviño, 2006). This implies a rise in interest in research on the ethical dimension of leadership, which is called ethical leadership.

Ethical leadership (EL) shows overlap with transformational leadership because one of its dimensions ‘idealized influence’ suggests the ethical standards and ethical behavior of the leader (Brown, Treviño & Harrison, 2005). Overlap with transactional leadership exists since an ethical leader will set standards and reward behavior if these standards are met. According to Treviño, Hartman and Brown (2000) ethical leadership is about being a moral person as well as a moral manager. The first focuses on the authenticity of the leader’s ethical behavior and the second
implies that the leader uses its position to draw attention to ethics and values. Earlier research proposes that ethical leaders are able to influence behavior of followers in a positive way, for example by stimulating extra role behavior.

Besides ethical leaders, other actors in the organization can influence employee behavior as well. For example, the HR department designs HR practices, such as training and reward systems, that line managers can use to stimulate employee performance (Guest, 1997). Since leaders are the direct supervisors of employees, HR should be able to influence behavior through their leaders as a sort of trickle-down effect (Mayer et al., 2009). Research on HR as a behavioral influencer remains scarce but is important for practitioners, since organizations want to know whether the practices they invest in are worth the investment. As stated above, the ethical aspect in leadership has become increasingly important due to the rise in need for ethical guidance (Brown & Treviño, 2006). As a result of the combination of these two arguments this research will investigate whether an ethical leader can influence behavioral outcomes and if EL functions as a mediator in the relationship between HR practices and outcomes.

Most of the research on ethical leadership concerns individual outcomes, which implies that there is a gap in the literature concerning team level outcomes. Moreover, a lot of today’s work is performed in teams, and therefore individual perceptions of two team outcomes are investigated in this research. First, the effect on collective efficacy will be tested. Research has shown that there is a relationship between ethical leadership and self-efficacy (Walumbwa et al., 2011). Self-efficacy is the beliefs in one’s capabilities (Bandura, 1977). However, the relationship between EL and collective efficacy, which are efficacy beliefs on a team level, must be further investigated. Bandura’s Social Learning Theory (SLT) (1977) is one of the two theories that is used in explaining effects of ethical leadership and is also used in the literature concerning efficacy. Therefore, SLT will be used to explain in which way EL can affect collective efficacy.

The second outcome is the perception of team-oriented commitment, which concerns an individual’s commitment to the team (Bishop & Scott, 2000). Scott & Townsend (1994) have already investigated individual perceptions of team commitment and stated that a committed team will perform better. This effect on performance is a reason why research on team-oriented commitment is important. Besides, most of the research on commitment focuses on
organizational commitment which implies that there is a gap in the literature and this research will contribute to fill the gap. With the use of the reasoning in the Social Exchange Theory (SET) (Blau, 1964) there will be explained that through the existence of a social exchange relationship between the ethical leader and followers, team commitment increases.

Finally, it is important to know whether HR can affect these team outcomes via EL. This implies that EL will function as a mediator in the positive relationships between HR practices and collective efficacy and team-oriented commitment. First, a trickle-down effect from perceptions of HRM to ethical leadership affecting collective efficacy in the end will be explained by the Social Learning Theory (Bandura, 1977), since employees are expected to learn from behavior that is displayed by the leader and the consequences of behavior through rewards and punishments. Second, a similar trickle-down effect on team-oriented commitment will be investigated. With the use of the Social Exchange Theory (Blau, 1964) this relationship will be explained. The SET states that when a person or entity acts in favor of another, this favor will be reciprocated by for example increased levels of team-oriented commitment.

The research question central to this research is: How does ethical leadership relate to collective efficacy and team-oriented commitment and does ethical leadership function as a mediator in the positive relationship between HRM and collective efficacy and team-oriented commitment?

In order to answer the research question in the next section a theoretical framework will be provided. First, ethical leadership will be conceptualized and both the SLT and SET will be briefly introduced. Afterwards, collective efficacy will be defined and its relationship with ethical leadership will be explained with the use of the SLT. The definition of team-oriented commitment and its relationship with ethical leadership will then be explained, based on the SET. The theoretical framework will be concluded with a theoretical explanation of the trickle-down effect from perceptions of HRM to ethical leadership, to collective efficacy and team-oriented commitment with the use of both SLT and SET. The methods section outlines in what way the research was conducted, which scales were used and how the statistical analysis was performed. The execution of this analysis and its results will be presented in the results section, concluding whether the hypothesis were supported or rejected. This research ends with a conclusion and
discussion, including theoretical implications, strengths and limitations, practical implications, suggestions for future research and a concluding paragraph.

2. Theoretical framework

2.1 Ethical leadership

According to Treviño ‘individuals search outside themselves for guidance in ethical dilemmas’ (1986, p. 615). Therefore, the need for ethical leadership (EL) has grown. Ethical leadership can be defined 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, Treviño & Harrison, 2005, p. 120). The first part implies that ethical leaders need to be role models displaying behavior that employees perceive as suitable. The second part means that ethical leaders set a norm for behavior, act upon it and will reward or punish behavior when necessary. This norm for behavior will be aligned with the cultural and organizational norms, implying that one ultimate normatively appropriate conduct does not exist. The two-way communication suggests that followers are allowed to discuss the norm with their leader. Finally, the decision-making part signifies that decisions are aligned with the ethical norm. Followers will be well aware of the decisions that are made and can copy actions of their leader (Brown et al., 2005). In order to be perceived as an ethical leader, the leader must be attractive, credible and legitimate (Brown et al., 2005). The behavior that will be displayed by someone who is perceived as an ethical leader includes fairness and honesty and ‘suggest altruistic (rather than selfish) motivation’ (Brown et al., 2005, p. 120).

The Social Learning Theory (SLT) (Bandura, 1977) is used by Brown et al. (2005) to explain the effects of EL. In accordance with this theory, followers will learn from the behavior of the ethical role model through vicarious experience. This type of experience implies that people learn by watching ethical leaders’ behavior and its consequences. Hereby, employees will become aware of what kind of behavior is expected, and the accompanying rewards or punishments. They will mimic the behavior displayed by their ethical leader and will behave in a way that they have learned to have positive consequences or avoid behavior with negative consequences. In order to make this social learning effective, the role model needs to have an
important position in the organization. Leaders are very suitable for the role modelling (Brown et al., 2005). Previous studies (e.g., Neubert, Carlson, Kacmar, Roberts & Chonko, 2009) used the SLT and therefore this theory will be used to explain the relationship between EL and employee outcomes.

Another theory used to illustrate outcomes of ethical leadership is the Social Exchange Theory (SET) (Blau, 1964). Blau (1964) distinguishes between two types of social exchanges; namely transactional and socioemotional. The former is concerned with economical exchanges, such as money, whereas the latter is concerned with exchanges of interpersonal treatment, such as trust or fairness (Mayer, Kuenzi, Greenbaum, Bardes & Salvador, 2009). Both types of exchanges are built on the notion of reciprocity (Gouldner, as cited in Mayer et al., 2009). This implies that if person A in the social exchange relationship acts in a way that is beneficial for person B, person B will feel obligated to reciprocate this behavior. Ethical leaders and their followers are in a social exchange relationship in which employees feel trusted and receive an ethical treatment, which implies that this exchange relationship is socioemotional (Brown & Treviño, 2006). The trust displayed by and the fair treatment of the leader will be reciprocated by followers through behavior that is beneficial for the organization (Mayer et al., 2009). Furthermore, SET will be used to explain the relationship between EL and employee outcomes.

Earlier research has investigated the antecedents and outcomes of ethical leadership. For example, Neubert et al. (2009) tested the influence of ethical leadership on follower job satisfaction and affective commitment. They found a positive and significant relation between these variables. Their research was based on the SLT, among other theories, which was used to explain how employee behavior was affected by ethical leaders. The earlier mentioned research by Mayer et al. (2009) used a combination of Social Learning Theory and Social Exchange Theory to investigate ethical leadership as a mediator. They found evidence for the existence of the so-called ‘trickle-down’ effect from ethical leadership on a top management level, to ethical leadership on a supervisor level which eventually affected group-level deviance negatively and group-level organizational citizenship behavior positively. These empirical findings show that ethical leadership can influence individual outcomes as well as team outcomes. Since most of today’s work is carried out in teams, research on the relationship between ethical leadership and team outcomes becomes increasingly important. In the following paragraphs, the relationships
between ethical leadership and collective efficacy and team-oriented commitment will be explained building on the SLT (Bandura, 1977) and the SET (Blau, 1964).

2.2 Collective efficacy

When broadly defined, efficacy can be seen as the belief in capability to perform tasks that lead up to preset goals (Bandura, 1997). Since efficacy is related to tasks and tasks are often executed in teams, collective efficacy beliefs can be distinguished (Riggs, Warka, Babasa, Betancourt, & Hooker, 1994). In this sense, collective efficacy can be defined as ‘individuals’ assessments of their group’s collective ability to perform job-related behaviors’ (Riggs, et al., 1994, p. 794). According to Bandura (1982) the perception of collective efficacy will affect the amount of effort individual team members will put into their work, the choices a person makes, and the will to stay when a group fails. Besides, employees with collective efficacy beliefs are able to overcome difficulties by initiating effort.

Drawing from the social learning perspective, there are four different components influencing the level of collective efficacy (Bandura, 1982). Enactive attainment is the first, which implies that through success (or failure) experiences a person’s belief in capability to perform future tasks increases (or decreases). The second is vicarious experience, meaning that people are able to learn from observing others’ behavior. The physiological state is the third component where the level of arousal, positive or negative, will affect efficacy beliefs. When a person is experiencing high levels of excitement, efficacy beliefs will be higher compared to when he is experiencing low levels of excitement. The last component that influences efficacy is verbal persuasion. An example of social persuasion is a colleague providing the team with positive encouragement about their capabilities (Bandura, 1977).

Since the perception of collective efficacy can influence team outcomes (e.g. overcoming difficulties, higher levels of effort) (Bandura, 1982), leaders must try to stimulate the efficacy beliefs. Earlier research has already found a relationship between ethical leadership and self-efficacy (Walumbwa et al., 2011). This research also states that all four components affecting the level of collective efficacy, can be influenced by ethical leaders (Walumbwa et al., 2011).
2.3 Ethical leadership and collective efficacy

The relationship between collective efficacy and ethical leadership can be explained with the Social Learning Theory (SLT) by Bandura (1977). Bandura (as cited in Walumbwa et al., 2011, p. 206) states that ‘social factors such as leadership, more so when such leaders are credible and demonstrate moral conduct, play a critical role in developing and strengthening efficacy beliefs’. This implies a positive relationship between EL and collective efficacy.

This positive relationship is mentioned before by Zhu, May and Avolio where is stated that ‘employees of ethical leaders should have higher feelings of competence in their positions’ (2004, p. 20). In other words, ethical leadership can enhance efficacy beliefs. This notion can be built on the SLT (Bandura, 1977). In the article of Mayer et al. (2012) the SLT is used to explain the outcomes of ethical leadership. They state that through a reward and punishment system, employees will learn about expected behavior and that learning will take place vicariously (Bandura as cited in Mayer et al., 2009). The article of Walumbwa et al. (2011) explains the link between ethical leadership and self-efficacy and the line of reasoning can be used to explain the relationship between ethical leadership and collective efficacy beliefs as well, since collective efficacy is rooted in self-efficacy (Bandura, 1982). Vicarious learning and verbal persuasion are components concerning the outcomes of work, which can be affected by an ethical leader that puts employees in positions that facilitate growth opportunities and which stimulate confidence. Besides, Walumbwa et al. (2011) state that physiological states and performance attainments are related to the process of work. Ethical leaders can decrease negative levels of arousal by providing support to employees in focusing on the process of work. Performance attainments can be enhanced by creating a safe environment in which leaders can give direct feedback concerning the performance attainments (Walumbwa & Schaubroek, 2009). To summarize, an ethical leader will support his employees in gaining trust (Walumbwa et al., 2011) in their own and their team’s ability, hereby stimulating the collective efficacy beliefs.

Earlier related research found a positive and significant relationship between leadership in general and collective efficacy (Chen & Bliese, 2002). This research was a successor of the laboratory study performed by Sosik, Avolio and Kahai (1997), in which a positive effect of transformational leadership on collective efficacy was hypothesized and found. Walumbwa et al. (2004) investigated and found that collective efficacy functioned as a mediator in the relationship between transformational leadership and work outcomes such as satisfaction and organizational
commitment. In a cross-sectional study the relationship between ethical leadership and self-efficacy was studied and a positive correlation was found (Walumbwa et al., 2011). Since transformational leadership and ethical leadership do show some overlap (Brown & Treviño, 2006) and collective efficacy is rooted in self-efficacy (Bandura, 1982), the existence of a positive relation between EL and collective efficacy is expected. This leads to the following hypothesis:

**H1: Ethical leadership is positively related to collective efficacy beliefs.**

### 2.4 Team-oriented commitment

Team(-oriented) commitment is defined by Bishop and Scott (2000) as ‘the relative strength of an individual’s identification with, and involvement in, a particular team’. This definition is similar to the definition of organizational commitment. The Organizational Commitment Questionnaire, which is the most commonly used scale in measuring commitment, has been successfully used studying commitment on a different entity than the organizational level only (Scott & Townsend, 1994). According to Bishop and Scott (2002) team-oriented commitment can be characterized by the following three aspects. First, employees with a high level of team commitment are willing to accept and believe in their team’s goals and values. Second, these employees are willing to ‘go the extra mile’ in favor of their team. Third and finally, highly committed team members wish to maintain active in this team (Bishop & Scott, 2000).

Team-oriented commitment can be considered to be an exchange variable. The Social Exchange Theory (Blau, 1964) states that when one actor does the other actor a favor, the receiver of this favor will feel the obligation to repay this favor resulting in an exchange relationship between individuals or entities. Earlier research found that favorable treatment in a social exchange relationship would be reciprocated with increased levels of commitment. For instance, the research of Walumbwa, Orwa, Wang and Lawler (2005) found that transformational leadership is positively related to organizational commitment. The reasoning behind this is that transformational leaders offer personal attention to their followers (Walumbwa & Kuchinke, as cited in Walumbwa et al., 2005) which will be reciprocated by more commitment to the organization. Besides commitment on an organizational level, leaders could
enhance team-oriented commitment as well. As stated by Strauss, Griffin and Rafferty (2009) ‘leadership at different levels is likely to enhance commitment at corresponding levels’. This statement combined with the principles of the SET will be used in order to explain the relationship between ethical leadership and team-oriented commitment.

2.5 Ethical leadership and team-oriented commitment

The Social Exchange Theory (SET) states that social exchange refers to ‘relationships that entail unspecified future obligations’ (Konovsky & Pugh, 1994). Leaders and followers are in a social exchange relationship. Building on the SET, employees are willing to behave in a way that is beneficial to the team as a result of their trust in and the principled treatment of their leader (Mayer et al., 2009). Employees who are fairly treated by their leaders, as is the case for ethical leadership, will adopt fairness as their own value. Fair treatment also leads to the willingness to remain in the team and employees are willing to repay the leader for the fair treatment they received (Bishop & Scott, 2000). The structural distance between leaders and employees is another aspect that needs to be considered when discussing commitment on a team level. This distance is concerned with the number of hierarchical levels in between the leader and followers (Avolio, Zhu, Koh & Bhatia, 2004). When the structural distance between the leader and the team is small, the developed exchange relationship will be repaid by team members with an increased level of commitment to their team (Eisenberger, Fasolo & Davis-LaMastro, 1990).

In the research of Strauss, Griffin and Rafferty (2009), a positive relationship was found between team leaders’ transformational leadership and followers’ team commitment. Zhu, May and Avolio (2004) propose that ethical leadership and organizational commitment are related. They base this proposition on studies that have shown that commitment is enhanced by leaders who let employees engage in decision-making (Rhodes & Steer, 1981) and who provide their employees with fair treatment (Allen & Meyer, 1990). Employee engagement in decision-making and fair treatment of employees are characteristics fitting the conceptualization of ethical leadership. This proposed relationship has been investigated by Kim and Brymer (2011), who did find a relationship between ethical leadership and organizational commitment. Besides, Neubert et al. (2009) researched both the direct and indirect effect of ethical leadership on organizational commitment. They found that ethical leadership is related to commitment directly
and through ethical climate (Neubert et al., 2009). Even though these researches have not investigated the relationship between ethical leadership and commitment on a team level, it can be expected that ethical leadership is related to team-oriented commitment as well if the structural difference between the ethical leader and the team members is small. Based on these findings the second hypothesis is:

\[
H2: \text{Ethical leadership is positively related to employee perceptions of team-oriented commitment.}
\]

2.6 Perceived HRM and the mediating role of ethical leadership

Besides ethical leaders, the HR department tries to affect employee behavior as well. The main goal of human resource management (HRM) is to develop both individual and workforce performance (Boxall & Purcell, 2008). HR functions as a strategic player nowadays (De Winne & Sels, 2003). Strategic HRM (SHRM) can be defined as ‘the pattern of planned human resource deployments and activities intended to enable an organization to achieve its goals’ (1992, p. 4). The model developed by Guest (1997) can be used to examine the relationship between (strategic) HRM and performance. In this model, HR practices are expected to influence the commitment and motivation of employees, leading to an increase in performance when managed properly (Guest, 1997). The challenge for HR is to influence the behavioral outcomes of employees so that actual changes in performance will be achieved. This is often referred to as the ‘black-box’ principle (Boxall & Purcell, 2008). In order to grasp what happens in this black-box, employees’ perceptions of HR practices must be taken into account. According to Kalshoven and Boon, HRM can be seen ‘as the associated practices which function as an organization’s resources’ (2012, p. 61). Since the practices an organization has chosen are signals to their employees, the way employees perceive them can differ (Den Hartog, Boselie, & Paauwe, 2004). These perceptions of HRM can be used to explain attitudes and behavior (Purcell & Hutchinson, 2007). For example, one employee perceives the training program as a positive contribution to his development while his colleague perceives the training as an increase in job demands. Therefore, employee perceptions of HR will be studied in this research. More specifically, it is argued that some sort of trickledown effect occurs: employee perceptions of HRM are positively related to ethical leadership and in turn to employee perceptions of collective efficacy and team-oriented commitment.
Leadership is of crucial importance in the implementation of HR practices (Purcell, Kinnie, Hutchinson, Rayton, & Swart, 2003). Even though the standards for performance are set at higher levels in the organization, for example by top management, direct leaders have a greater effect on employee work outcomes (Brandes, Dharwadkar & Wheatley, 2004). This is due to the fact that the relationship between leaders and followers is more intimate and requires frequent interaction, compared to the relationship between employees and higher management (Mayer et al., 2009). This suggests that leadership will mediate the relationship between higher management and employee outcomes. More specifically, this holds for the relationship between HRM and ethical leadership. According to Wistanley and Woodall (2000), HRM has an ethical dimension. They state that ethics, among other aspects, are fundamental for the decisions made by the HR department. Besides, there is stated that the HR department can function as a ‘guardian of ethics’ (Wistanley & Woodall, 2000, p. 7) where ethical practices will be designed and the department will be responsible for the communication of ethical conduct. They conclude with stating that the ethical responsibility must be shared with senior management and line managers (Wistanley & Woodall, 2000). Therefore, there can be stated that a relationship between HRM and ethical leadership exists, in which the ethical aspect of the leadership style matches the ethical dimension of HRM.

Mayer et al. (2009) have investigated a trickle-down effect, in which they state that top management ethical leadership affects supervisors’ ethical leadership which in turn affects the groups’ behavior. In their article, the SLT and the SET are used to explain these relationships. These theories combined with the logic from the trickle-down effect provide a theoretical foundation for the mediating role of ethical leadership in the relationships between perceptions of HRM and collective efficacy and team-oriented commitment.

First, the Social Learning Theory (Bandura, 1977) explains this trickle-down effect from perceptions of HRM to ethical leadership and in the end resulting in increased levels of collective efficacy. At the organizational level, the HR department creates practices based on behavioral standards set by senior management, which should be implemented by ethical leaders. On a team level, leaders will be the ones rewarding or punishing employee behavior, while using these practices. Team members will learn about expected behavior through this reward- and punishment system (Bandura, 1977). Even when the reward or punishment is not directly aimed
at a specific employee, employees can still learn vicariously. This implies that when fellow team members are rewarded or punished, individual employees will learn about the consequences of certain behaviors (Bandura, 1977). Thus, if the ethical leader is able to ‘translate’ the norms set by the HR department into behavioral standards from which employees can learn, their confidence in the team’s ability will increase.

Second, the Social Exchange Theory (Blau, 1964) provides an argumentation for the trickle-down effect from perceived HRM to ethical leadership and then resulting in more team-commitment. HR practices are to be implemented by ethical leaders. Concerning these leaders Mayer et al. (2009) state that ‘here they create positive exchanges, which create an obligation in the work unit to return positive behaviors’. One example of returning positive behaviors is through increased levels of commitment, and since the ethical leader has an intimate relationship with the team, there can be expected that the team-oriented commitment will be affected.

Not much research has been conducted on the ‘black-box’ principle and therefore this study adds to the HR literature. However, some research on individual level outcomes of HR practices has been conducted. For example the research of Gould-Williams (2003) provides evidence for the existence of a relationship between perceptions of HR practices and trust and organizational performance. Following the reasoning on the trickle-down effect as stated by Mayer et al. (2009) and with the help of the SLT, it is expected that ethical leadership will mediate the relationship between perceived HRM and collective efficacy. Besides, using the SET it is expected that the relationship between perceptions of HR and employee perceptions of team-oriented commitment will be mediated by ethical leadership. Therefore the last two hypotheses are formulated and displayed below. All the hypothesized relationships are displayed in the conceptual model in Figure 1.

\[H3:\] The relationship between perceived HRM and employee perceptions of collective efficacy is mediated by ethical leadership.

\[H4:\] The relationship between perceived HRM and employee perceptions of team-oriented commitment is mediated by ethical leadership.
3. Methods

3.1 Design, population and sample

In this explanatory research the positive relationship between ethical leadership, collective efficacy and team-oriented commitment was investigated. Besides, it tested whether ethical leadership mediates the relationships between perceived HRM, and collective efficacy and team-oriented commitment. To investigate these relationships a survey research with a cross-sectional design was conducted. This implies that data gathering took place at just one moment in time, therefore no conclusions can be drawn about causality of the relationships (Mann, 2003).

The unit of analysis in this research was the individual employee. Data was gathered through the distribution of online self-report questionnaires with the use of the program ‘Survey Monkey’. The program allowed keeping track of the response rate and sending reminders to the people who did not fill out the questionnaire yet. The reminders were sent one and two weeks after the first launch of the questionnaire, and addressed exclusively to the people that did not fill out the questionnaire yet.

The following requirements were met with regard to selecting the participants. First, the participants must be working in a team with a minimum of three members. This minimum of
three is set by the researcher, since there can be argued that this is the minimum number of members to be able to call it a team. Second, they must have a superior. In other words, top managers or entrepreneurs could not participate in this study. With the use of their own network a group of four students has gathered the data and respondents were approached via e-mail, Facebook or LinkedIn. Since the data collection took place via convenience sampling, using the network of four master thesis students, the researchers assured that a high variability of organizations will be approached. Through convenience sampling, a minimum total of 120 respondents were collected.

The questionnaire (Appendix A) that was distributed contained scales that needed to be included for the sake of the other students’ researches and were not used in this study. Pretesting of the questionnaire took place in order to check and correct for mistakes. Besides, the length of the questionnaire was monitored during the pretesting phase. It took approximately 20 minutes to fill out the questionnaire. To prevent duplications, respondents were only able to fill out the questionnaire through clicking on the link in the e-mail that is personally sent to them. The first page of the questionnaire displayed an introductory text, to inform the respondents about the goal, procedure, confidentiality of the study and the length of the questionnaire. To provide the respondents with the opportunity to ask questions, the contact details of one of the researchers were added. No reward was given to the participants.

The original dataset consisted of 156 respondents and the response rate was 53.58%. A selection was made based on the following requirements: First, the respondents who answered they were not working in a team, were excluded from the analysis. Second, the respondents with a minimum team size of three members were selected for the analysis. Third, respondents who did not fill out the questions concerning collective efficacy and team-oriented commitment were excluded from the analysis. This selection has resulted in a total of 107 respondents. Of these 107 respondents 62 were male (57.9%). The average age in this sample was 33 (SD = 11.99) and the majority of the respondents had a permanent contract (64.5%). More than half of the respondents in this sample is highly educated, with 25 respondents having a university degree (23.4%) and 46 participants who finished higher vocational education (43.0%). The sample showed a great variance in team size, with an average of 12 team members (SD = 12). This sample is marginally representative for the Dutch workforce, when checking the numbers from
the CBS for the year 2011. The distribution of male workers in this year was 55.59% and the average age of all workers was 42 years, the latter being within one standard deviation from the mean in the sample at hand. However, the educational level in this sample is higher compared to the Dutch workforce in whom only 34.43% is highly educated (CBS, 2014).

3.2 Measures
The variables perceived HRM, ethical leadership, team-oriented commitment and collective efficacy beliefs were measured using existing scales. Concerning the number of factors that are necessary, a principal factor analysis has been conducted for every single variable. The factor loadings for each scale can be found in Appendix B. The number of factors which Eigenvalue exceeds 1 was selected, unless the scree plot was more decisive (Catell, 1966; Pallant, 2007). Besides, the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin measure of sampling adequacy (KMO) must be at least .6 in order to conclude that the factor analysis is sufficient (Tabachnick & Fidell, 2005). A five-point Likert scale was used for all scales to indicate answers with options ranging from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

3.2.1 Perceived HRM
Lepak and Snell (2002) developed the Commitment HR configuration scale, which was used to measure perceived HRM. The Dutch translation of the English questionnaire developed by Lepak and Snell (2002) has been used in other studies to test perceptions of HRM on an employee level, even though the original questionnaire is aimed at measuring HRM amongst managers. One example of a research using the Dutch version to test employee relations is performed by Kalshoven and Boon (2012). This scale consisted of 22 items and an example of an item was “Performance appraisals for these employees include development feedback”.

From the factor analysis can be concluded that seven factors should be extracted, since those factors have an Eigenvalue that exceeded one. However, only one factor was selected since the scree plot showed that extracting just one factor would be sufficient and the KMO index of the scale was .76 with 27.10% of the variance explained. The reliability analysis showed that all items contributed to Cronbach’s α of the scale, which was .85.

3.2.2 Ethical leadership
The variable ethical leadership was measured with the use of the scale developed by Brown et al. (2005) containing 10 items. Respondents have rated how well ethical leadership is
represented and an example of an item was “My supervisor listens to what employees have to say”. The original scale was in English, but a Dutch translation of the scale was already used in other researches (Den Hartog & Belschak, 2012; Kalshoven & Boon, 2012).

Even though the factor analysis showed that two factors had an Eigenvalue exceeding one, only one factor was extracted. The scree plot showed that extracting only one factor would be sufficient and with a KMO index of .89 the factor analysis was sufficient. This one factor included all the 10 items of the scale, explaining 53.4% of the variance and with a Cronbach’s α of .89.

3.2.3 Collective efficacy

The Collective Efficacy Beliefs Scale (CEBS) by Riggs et al. (1994) was used to measure collective efficacy. The scale contained seven items and an example of an item was “Some members of this department should be fired due to lack of ability”. No Dutch translation of this scale was available, therefore the researcher has translated the scale into Dutch and asked the group of students, the same students as in the data collection group, to translate it back into English. This method is called the parallel back-translation procedure (Brislin, 1986). With the help of this procedure, an adequate translation of the original scale was developed (Vallerand et al., 1992). Some final adjustments have been made as a result of the back-translations.

Translation of a validated scale could affect its reliability and validity. The factor analysis showed that all seven items loaded on one factor, which had an Eigenvalue of 5.54. Besides, the KMO index was .90 and the explained variance was 79.14%. As a result, only one factor was extracted. Cronbach’s α was calculated to check for the reliability of the scale. The translated CEBS turned out to be reliable as well, with a Cronbach’s α of .96.

3.2.4 Team-oriented commitment

The Dutch scale developed by Ellemers, De Gilder and Van den Heuvel (1998) was used to measure team-oriented commitment. This scale consisted of five items and an example of an item is “I am prepared to do additional chores, when this benefits my team”.

For this scale one factor was extracted, since this was the only factor with an Eigenvalue > 1 and the KMO index was .85. The scale accounted for 82.41% of the variance. All items loaded on this single factor, and the Cronbach’s α for this scale was .95.
3.2.5 Control variables

Some control variables were added to the questionnaire to get an overview of the demographics of the sample. These variables are gender (1 = male, 2 = female), education level (1 = University degree, 2 = Higher vocational education, 3 = Pre-university education, 4 = Higher general secondary education, 5 = Lower secondary education, 6 = Intermediate vocational education, 7 = Other), and age in years. The other control variables are job-related and could have an effect on the relationship that was tested in this research. These were type of contract (1 = Permanent contract, 2 = Fixed term contract, 3 = Other), contract hours (per week), team size, tenure in the organization (years) and tenure in the team (years). This last variable can affect team commitment, as found in another research stating that tenure is related to commitment (Finkelstein & Hambrick, 1990). The reasoning behind this is that the longer an employee is working in the same team the higher his dedication towards the team will be. Team size was added to check whether the respondent meets the requirements to participate in this study.

3.2.6 Statistical analysis

Before running the analyses, correlations between the studied variables were calculated. Besides, correlations between the control variables and the variables in this research will be shown to see the strength of these relationships. When these control variables were found to be significantly correlating with the study variables, these were used as control variables testing the hypotheses of this study. In other words, this implies that these control variables will be added in the second block of all regressions, to check for spuriousness.

The first two hypotheses were tested by performing multiple regressions. To test hypothesis 1, collective efficacy was entered into the regression as a dependent variable and ethical leadership as the independent variable, while controlling for the control variables. The second hypothesis was tested with dependent variable team-oriented commitment and independent variable ethical leadership, while controlling for the control variables. Both hypotheses stated that the relationship is likely to be positive, therefore a positive and significant ($p < .05$) relation must be found in order to confirm them.

The last two hypotheses described the mediating role of ethical leadership in the relationship between perceived HRM and the outcomes on the team level. Regarding mediation
the steps from MacKinnon, Fairchild and Fritz (2007) must be followed and multiple regressions were used to perform these analyses, while controlling for the control variables. This method is quite similar to the four step approach from Baron and Kenny (1986). The main difference between these methods is that Baron and Kenny (1986) state that the independent and the dependent variable must be significantly related, whereas MacKinnon et al. (2007) argue that this is not a necessary condition. However, the regression of collective efficacy on perceived HRM will be added as a first step, since this relation does provide information about the strength of the mediation (MacKinnon & Fairchild, 2009). The following three steps must result in significant relationships to be able to conclude that a mediating effect exists. First, with respect to the third hypothesis, perceived HRM must be significantly related to the mediator ethical leadership. The second step is equal to the relationship described in hypothesis 1, where the effect of ethical leadership on collective efficacy was tested. In the last step is checked whether the effect of perceived HRM on collective efficacy decreases when ethical leadership is added to the regression model.

Concerning the fourth hypotheses perceived HRM will be regressed on team-oriented commitment. The second regression, where perceived HRM is regressed on ethical leadership, remains the same as in the analysis of hypothesis 3. Hypothesis 2 is equal to the third regression in this case, testing the significance of the relation between ethical leadership and team-oriented commitment. Finally, the relationship between perceived HRM and team-oriented commitment must decrease if ethical leadership is included in the model. If all conditions were met, a Sobel test was conducted to calculate whether the mediation is significant (Preacher & Leonardelli, 2003).

4. Results

4.1 Descriptive statistics

The means, standard deviations and correlations of all studied variables and the control variables are displayed in Table 1. The hypotheses stated that all relationships should be positive, which implies that all correlations between perceived HRM, ethical leadership, collective efficacy, and team-oriented commitment should be positive. From Table 1 displayed on the next page can be concluded that this is the case. However, concerning ethical leadership only the
correlation with perceived HRM was found to be significant \( (r = .43, \ p < .01) \), which was in line with expectations. Ethical leadership did not have a significant correlation with neither collective efficacy \( (r = .19, \ n.s.) \) nor team-oriented commitment \( (r = .01, \ n.s.) \), which is not in line with the expectations. Besides its correlation with ethical leadership, perceived HRM positively correlates with both collective efficacy \( (r = .32, \ p < .01) \) as well as with team-oriented commitment \( (r = .20, \ p < .05) \). Even though the relationship between collective efficacy and team-oriented commitment \( (r = .81, \ p < .01) \) is not further investigated in this research, their high correlation is in line with previous research (e.g., Porter, 2005).

A number of control variables did not have a significant correlation with any of the variables in this research. These were age, type of contract, education level and tenure in the organization. Tenure in team significantly correlated with three studied variables. Tenure in team has a negative correlation with ethical leadership \( (r = -.12, \ p < .05) \) and a positive correlation with both collective efficacy \( (r = .22, \ p < .05) \) as well as with team-oriented commitment \( (r = .19, \ p < .05) \). The team size significantly correlates with both of the team outcomes studied in this research. The correlations with collective efficacy \( (r = .22, \ p < .05) \) and team-oriented commitment \( (r = .25, \ p < .01) \) were both positive. Perceived HRM positively correlated with two control variables and the first is gender \( (r = .20, \ p < .05) \). The last control variable with a significant correlation is the number of contract hours \( (r = .35, \ p < .01) \). These control variables were added to the second step of the regression, to check for spuriousness.
Table 1.

Means, standard deviations and correlations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>M</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>1.</th>
<th>2.</th>
<th>3.</th>
<th>4.</th>
<th>5.</th>
<th>6.</th>
<th>7.</th>
<th>8.</th>
<th>9.</th>
<th>10.</th>
<th>11.</th>
<th>12.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Perceived HRM</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Ethical Leadership</td>
<td>3.81</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td></td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Collective efficacy</td>
<td>3.30</td>
<td>1.27</td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Team-oriented commitment</td>
<td>3.48</td>
<td>1.20</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.81**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Gender(a)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Age</td>
<td>33.41</td>
<td>11.99</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.11</td>
<td>-.18</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Type of contract(b)</td>
<td></td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.09</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>-.01</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>-.28**</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Education level</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>.08</td>
<td>-.21*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. Contract hours</td>
<td>30.65</td>
<td>12.74</td>
<td>.35**</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>.07</td>
<td>-.00</td>
<td>-.35**</td>
<td>.27**</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Team size</td>
<td>11.50</td>
<td>11.39</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.25**</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.17</td>
<td>.23*</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Tenure in organization</td>
<td>4.95</td>
<td>5.44</td>
<td>-.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.61**</td>
<td>-.51*</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Tenure in team</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.20*</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td>.19*</td>
<td>.02</td>
<td>.31**</td>
<td>-.35**</td>
<td>.34**</td>
<td>-.08</td>
<td>.21*</td>
<td>.42**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{**}p<.01\) \(^{*}p<.05\)

\(a\) Gender was coded (0) men and (1) women.
\(b\) Type of contract was coded (0) permanent contract and (1) fixed term contract.

\(N=107\)

Between brackets: Cronbach’s \(\alpha\)
4.2.1 Ethical leadership regressed on Collective Efficacy

In order to test hypothesis 1 a regression was conducted. The results of the regression are displayed in Table 2. The first hypothesis was concerned with the positive direct relationship between ethical leadership and collective efficacy. A positive but non-significant relation between ethical leadership and collective efficacy was found ($\beta = .19$, $p = .053$), rejecting hypothesis 1. The relation between ethical leadership and collective efficacy slightly decreased after the control variables were added into the model ($\beta = .18$, $p = n.s$).

Table 2.

Regressions of collective efficacy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethical leadership</td>
<td>.19</td>
<td>.18</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived HRM</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.32**</td>
<td>.29**</td>
<td>.30**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure in team</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.23**</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract hours</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team size</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender</td>
<td>.13</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.11</td>
<td>.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔR²</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td></td>
<td>.09</td>
<td></td>
<td>.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>3.362**</td>
<td>3.83</td>
<td>6.08**</td>
<td>4.33**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*p < .01
*p < .05
aGender was coded (0) men and (1) women.
N=107

4.2.2 Ethical leadership regressed on Team-oriented Commitment

The second hypothesis stated that ethical leadership would have a positive effect on team-oriented commitment. Table 3 shows that ethical leadership and team-oriented commitment are not significantly related ($\beta = .01$, $p = .95$). After the control variables were added, the relation became negative and remained non-significant ($\beta = -.03$, $p = .75$). Hereby, the second hypothesis was rejected.


4.2.3 The mediating role of ethical leadership

This research hypothesized that ethical leadership would have a mediating role in the relationship between perceived HRM and collective efficacy and team-oriented commitment. For hypothesis 3, the second step for mediation is in line with hypothesis 1, which was rejected. For hypothesis 4, the second step for mediation is in line with hypothesis 2, which was rejected as well. In this paragraph the remaining steps testing mediation will be described to create an overview of the results for the third and fourth hypothesis, although one of the requirements for mediation is not met.

The third hypothesis stated that ethical leadership would mediate the relationship between perceived HRM and collective efficacy. The first regression tests whether the dependent variable is related to the independent variable. A positive and significant relation between perceived HRM and collective efficacy was found ($\beta = .32, p < .01$) as can be seen in Table 2. In the next regression ethical leadership was regressed on perceived HRM, resulting in a positive and significant relation ($\beta = .43, p < .01$). Results are displayed in Table 4. As stated above, hypothesis 1 and the second step for mediation are equal. The regression showed that no significant relationship was found between ethical leadership and collective efficacy ($\beta = .19, p$

---

**Table 3.**

*Regressions of team-oriented commitment*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ethical leadership</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>-.03</td>
<td>-.10</td>
<td>-.15</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perceived HRM</td>
<td></td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td>.24*</td>
<td>.28*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure in team</td>
<td>.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract hours</td>
<td>.08*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team size</td>
<td>.22*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gendera</td>
<td>.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R²</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.10</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td>.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ΔR²</td>
<td>.05</td>
<td></td>
<td>.03</td>
<td></td>
<td>.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>2.21</td>
<td>.01</td>
<td>2.59</td>
<td>3.01*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* $p < .01$
* $p < .05$

Gender was coded (0) men and (1) women.

N=107

---
In the final step ethical leadership was added into the model testing the regression of collective efficacy on perceived HRM. The relationship between perceived HRM and collective efficacy decreases but remains significant, after ethical leadership was entered into the model (β = .29, p < .01). Even though two of the three steps for mediation resulted in significant results, the mediating role of ethical leadership in the relation between perceived HRM and collective efficacy is not supported by the data. Since no significant relation was found between ethical leadership and collective efficacy, hypothesis 3 was rejected.

Table 4.

Regressions of ethical leadership

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Perceived HRM</td>
<td>.43**</td>
<td>.41**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tenure in team</td>
<td>-21*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contract hours</td>
<td>-.02</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Team size</td>
<td>.20*</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gendera</td>
<td>.14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| R²    | .19  | .28 |
| ΔR²   |      | .24 |
| F     | 23.81** | 7.84** |

**p < .01
*p < .05
aGender was coded (0) men and (1) women.
N=107

Hypothesis 4 stated that ethical leadership would also function as a mediator in the relationship between perceived HRM and team-oriented commitment. First, team-oriented commitment was regressed on perceived HRM. This relation was found to be positive and significant (β = .20, p < .05) and the results of this regression are displayed in Table 3. Step one concerning mediation for this hypothesis is equal to step one for hypothesis 3, where a significant relation between perceived HRM and ethical leadership was found (β = .43, p < .01). The second mediation step is in line with hypothesis 2. The analysis showed a non-significant relationship between ethical leadership and team-oriented commitment (β = .01, p = .10) and results are shown in Table 3. In the last mediation step, ethical leadership was added into the
model testing the regression of perceived HRM on team-oriented commitment. The relationship between perceived HRM and team-oriented increases and remains significant, after ethical leadership was entered into the model (β = .24, p < .05). In order to confirm hypothesis 4, it is required that ethical leadership and team-oriented commitment are significantly related and that the final mediation step must result in a decreased relation between perceived HRM and team-oriented commitment. Both requirements were not met, resulting in the rejection of hypothesis 4.

5. Discussion

The interplay between HRM and ethical leadership was investigated in this research. More specifically, the relationship between perceived HRM and collective efficacy and team-oriented commitment was predicted to be mediated by ethical leadership. The relationship between ethical leadership and collective efficacy was not supported by the data. The relationship between ethical leadership and team-oriented commitment, the other outcome variable in the model, was not supported by the data as well. Additionally, the mediating role of ethical leadership was not supported by the data. In other words, the relationships between perceived HRM and collective efficacy and team-oriented commitment are not mediated by ethical leadership. Therefore, the third and fourth hypothesis, stating the mediating role of ethical leadership, were rejected. Although the relationships between perceived HRM and the team outcomes were not hypothesized, the data analysis supports these relationships. Perceived HRM was positively related to collective efficacy as well as to team-oriented commitment. Besides, a positive relationship between perceived HRM and ethical leadership was found. The implications of these findings will be discussed below.

5.1 Theoretical implications

The relationship between ethical leadership and collective efficacy, as stated in hypothesis 1, was not supported by the data. Even though the Social Learning Theory (SLT) (Bandura, 1977) indicates that an ethical leader can affect the collective efficacy beliefs, the research at hand does not support this relationship. A possible explanation can be found in the SLT as well. According to this theory, collective efficacy can be enhanced through vicarious learning, verbal persuasion, affective arousal and enactive mastery (Bandura, 1982). Walumbwa et al. (2011) stated that all these factors can be stimulated by leaders. However, there are a number of other people who can affect the level of collective efficacy beliefs besides the leader.
For example, team members can learn about expected behavior through observing each other’s behavior and its consequences or through verbal persuasion by colleagues. If employees do learn from their fellow team members, the effect of this learning on collective efficacy beliefs can cloud the relationship of ethical leadership and collective efficacy beliefs. In order to investigate if learning from team members does indeed cloud the relationship, qualitative or quantitative data should be gathered on learning behavior. Qualitative data can be gathered through interviews similar to the ones in the research by Billett (2002), in which questions regarding access to co-workers and the attitude and skills of co-workers were asked. Quantitative measurement of the source of learning can take place by developing a scale in which respondents must answer questions like ‘In case of a new task, I will turn to … for help’ where the answering options are for example ‘My supervisor’, ‘My colleague’, or ‘No one’. As is the case with all new scales, this scale should be validated and tested before it can be used. Both the qualitative as well as the quantitative approach will shed light on who the source of the social learning is.

Team-oriented commitment was not significantly affected by ethical leadership as well. This relationship was built on the Social Exchange Theory (SET) (Blau, 1964). According to this theory, as a result of the existence of the social exchange relationship team members will repay their leader with commitment when they feel trusted and supported (Mayer et al., 2009). Future obligations are a result of these relationships (Konovsky & Pugh, 1994). Besides, the nature of the exchange relationship might differ as a result of identity orientation (Flynn, 2005). Three types of identity orientations can be distinguished; namely personal, relational or collective. All of these identity orientations are connected to a different type of social exchange. A personal identity orientation is related to a negotiated exchange, which implies that the exchange relationship is based on explicit discussion of the terms of exchange and reciprocation is direct. Concerning a relational identity orientation, a reciprocal exchange relationship will be preferred. This exchange relationship is based on the belief that a favor will be reciprocated. This implies that in contrast to negotiated exchange, reciprocation does not take place immediately. The last type of identity orientation is collective identity orientation which is connected to generalized exchange. This is the most complex form of social exchange, since reciprocation takes place among at least three people. For example, person A does person B a favor who repays this favor by helping person C. In the end, reciprocation of the favor of person A will take place (Flynn, 2005). Therefore, the nature and complexity of the social exchange relationship based on an
individual’s identity orientation will affect the social exchange as well. In case of a collective orientation, the generalized exchange relationship is preferred in which the hope for reciprocation is present, but the source and terms are unknown (Flynn, 2005). Compared to individuals with either a personal or a relational identity orientation, an individual with a collective orientation will be specifically interested in the well-being of the total group (Brickson, 2005). Therefore, it can be stated that this type of orientation will affect commitment on a team level. Since this research has not investigated identity orientation, results on team-oriented commitment can be blurred by the different orientations towards social exchange relationships. This line of reasoning provides a possible justification why the relationship between ethical leadership and team-oriented commitment was not supported by the data. In future research respondents with a collective orientation should be isolated, since the relationship between ethical leaders and followers will then be more likely to affect team-oriented commitment. Therefore, the identity orientation of respondents must be determined with the use of the framework of Brewer and Gardner (1996).

The positive relationships between HRM and collective efficacy and team-oriented commitment were not proposed by this research. However, the data did support both relationships. Regarding to collective efficacy this implies that when an employee’s positive perceptions of the bundle of HR practices increases, the level of his collective efficacy beliefs will increase as well. Bandura’s Social Learning Theory (SLT) (1977) provides a theoretical explanation for the existence of this relationship. Inter alia, learning takes place via verbal persuasion according to this theory. Signal of trust in the team can be sent via the chosen HR practices (Den Hartog, Boselie & Paauwe, 2004), which results in higher levels of collective efficacy. In the case of team-oriented commitment, an increase in perceived HRM is coupled with an increase in the level of commitment. This relationship can be explained with the Social Exchange Theory (SET) by Konovsky and Pugh (1994). According to Eisenberger, Fasolo & Davis-LaMastro (1990) a social exchange relationship between the organization (or HR) and employees will advance, because the former will treat employees fairly whereas the latter will repay this with more team commitment. Hereby, some of the black-box principle of HR has been revealed. According to Boxall and Purcell (2008), HR must try to influence behavioral outcomes in order to gain changes in performance. This study contributes to the revelation of the black box,
by showing that perceptions of HRM are positively related to both collective efficacy and team-oriented commitment.

Ethical leadership was not found to have a mediating role in the relations between perceptions of HRM and the studied team outcomes. A trickle-down effect was expected in which positive perceptions of HRM would result in higher perceived ethical leadership which results in more collective efficacy beliefs and/or a higher level of team-oriented commitment. Collective efficacy beliefs were expected to be a result of a trickledown effect from perceptions of HRM on ethical leadership. According to the Social Learning Theory (Bandura, 1977) this increase in efficacy beliefs would be a result of the implementation of HR practices by the ethical leader. More specifically, with the use of a punishment and reward system the ethical leader would enable employees to learn about expected behavior. The trickle-down effect on team-oriented commitment was in line with the reasoning in the Social Exchange Theory (SET) (Blau, 1964), where the team members would reciprocate the support of both the HR department and their leader with a willingness to act in favor of the team. An explanation regarding the mediating role of ethical leadership is that substitutes exist that can ‘replace the effect of leadership on employee outcomes’ (Kalshoven & Boon, 2012, p. 60). Moreover, Kerr and Jermier (1978) suggest that when pertinent substitutes are present, the relationship between leadership and employee outcomes will be lessened. One of these substitutes is self-management. Drawing from the SLT, people will manage their own behavior and will reward and punish themselves when set standards are not met (Bandura, as cited in Manz & Sims, 1980). No measurements for self-management, or other substitutes of leadership, were included in this research. Therefore, it might be the case that the effect of ethical leadership can be replaced by the existence of substitutes. In order to investigate the isolated effect of ethical leadership on collective efficacy and team-oriented commitment, substitutes of leadership must be added into the research. The effects of these substitutes can then be controlled.

5.2 Limitations and strengths

If a follow-up research on the interplay between ethical leadership and HRM is conducted, the following limitations, suggestions for future research and strengths should be taken into account.
The use of a cross-sectional design is a first limitation, because no conclusion on causality can be drawn (Mann, 2003). This implies that even though a relationship was found between perceived HRM and team-oriented commitment for example, there is no guarantee that the direction of this relationship runs from perceived HRM to team-oriented commitment. It could be that an increase in team-oriented commitment results in an increase in perceived HRM, instead of the other way around. Although based on the current literature it is more likely that HRM results in higher levels of commitment (e.g., Paul & Anantharaman, 2004), a longitudinal design is needed to test this.

A second limitation of this research is the use of convenience sampling. As a result, the representativeness of the sample can be lower compared to a research in which random sampling was used. One example of how this has affected the results is the average education level, which was higher compared to the numbers from the CBS (CBS, 2014). As a result, this sample provides a distorted view. As can be seen in Table 1, no significant correlation between education level and any of the studied variables was found. These correlations can become significant if a random sample was used. This means that the effect of the control variable can be present, but is not visible due to the use of convenience sampling. Therefore, future researchers should make use of random sampling since this method will create equal chances of being selected for all members of the population which results in a sample with a higher level of representativeness (Lunsford & Lunsford, 1995).

Besides, no questions regarding positions or industry were included in the questionnaire. The researchers did approach a wide variety of companies and people in different functions, but there is no information available about the industries or the nature of the job that can be compared to the numbers of the Dutch workforce. Therefore, there cannot be concluded that this sample is representative for the Dutch workforce in terms of functions industry.

Another aspect that harmed this research is a result of using the Commitment HR configuration scale (Lepak & Snell, 2002). The factor analysis showed that the items loaded on seven different factors, and the factor loadings were below .30 in many of the cases. A possible explanation why the factor analysis did not result in one valid factor, is that the scale was originally developed for perceptions of managers instead of perceptions of employees (Lepak & Snell, 2002). However, this scale was already successfully used to investigate employee
perceptions (Kalshoven & Boon, 2012) and this problematic factor analysis was therefore not expected. In order to overcome this problem, future research should be focused upon the development of a scale to measure perceptions of HRM on an individual employee level. For example by asking questions regarding the perceived goal of the reward system, or regarding the training opportunities the organization offers. Comparing answers to these questions to the answers of managers on for example the Commitment HR configuration scale, provides an insight in whether perceptions of employees are in line with the management’s intentions.

It took the respondents approximately 20 minutes to fill out the questionnaire. The length is an explanation of the number of respondents that did not complete the questionnaire. Besides, it can have affected the response rate since earlier research showed that the length of the questionnaire can negatively affect the number of respondents (Dillman, Sinclair & Clark, 1993). To solve this issue, scales that are not included in the current research should be excluded from the questionnaires in future researches.

Measuring collective efficacy and team-oriented commitment through employee perceptions in multiple organizations can be named as a limitation as well. Even though the used scales (Ellemers, De Gilder & Van den Heuvel 1998; Riggs et al., 1994) are specifically developed to measure these variables on an individual level, the team outcomes are a collection of outcomes from several organizations. Therefore it is suggested that research on team level outcomes, whether through individual perceptions or aggregated scores, must take place in a single organization. For example the study of Pearce (2004) used individual assessments of team commitment and aggregated the scores to the team level. As a result, conclusions about a team’s actual collective efficacy and commitment can be drawn, instead of solely relying on individual employee perceptions. When all variables in this research were measured at the unit level in a single organization, conclusions could be drawn about the way team perceptions of HRM and ethical leadership affect the outcomes collective efficacy and team-oriented commitment.

Besides the limitations mentioned above, this research has its strength as well. The most important strength of this research is the diverse dataset. The students who collaborated in the data collection, made sure that a variety of organizations was included. As a result, there was an even distribution of men and women in the sample. Comparing the sample to the numbers of the Centraal Bureau voor de Statistiek (CBS), showed that the sample is representative for the Dutch
workforce in terms of gender and age. The representativeness of the sample can be named as a second strength. Furthermore, most of the scales in this research were existing scales with a high validity and reliability. Hereby, it was assured that the items did represent the construct that was measured.

Another strength that can be mentioned is the fact that the researcher’s translation of the Collective Efficacy Beliefs Scale (CEBS) by Riggs et al. (1994) was very successful. The translation must be well performed on a linguistic level, which can be done with the use of the parallel back-translation procedure (Broslin, 1986). This method was used to translate the scale from English to Dutch. All items loaded on one factor and the reliability analysis resulted in a high Cronbach’s α, implying that the translation was done correctly.

5.3 Practical implications
This research offers some interesting insights to HR practitioners, even though further research on the interplay between leadership and HRM is needed. The relationship between HRM and the two studied variables, collective efficacy and team-oriented commitment, shows that the human resource department must take employee perceptions of HRM into account. For example by communicating behavioral expectations to employees and consequences of these behaviors, employee perceptions of HR will be closer to what is intended by the HR practices. Perceptions of HR can influence behavior and attitudes of employees, both positively as well as negatively (Purcell & Hutchinson, 2007). According to the research at hand, perceptions of HRM can influence individual perceptions of team level outcomes. Collective efficacy beliefs are known to affect the level of performance of employees (Bandura, 2000), which is positive for the organization. According to Bishop and Scott (2000), team-oriented commitment is characterized by members that are willing to go the extra mile. This is in favor of the organization as well. When the HR department is able to affect these team outcomes, by stimulating the positive perceptions of HR, the organization will benefit.

The relationship between HRM and ethical leadership found in this study emphasizes the importance of a partnership between the HR department and managers. As Purcell and Hutchinson (2007) suggest, front-line managers are the ones who will deliver the HR practices to the employees. Therefore, the HR department must work together with the team leaders in order to align the intended practices with the implemented practices. If the HR department would take
on the role of an ethical leader and hereby allowing the team’s leader to discuss the norm and to be involved in decision-making (Brown, Treviño & Harrison, 2005), it can be expected that this social exchange will be reciprocated by behavior that benefits the organization. In this case this would imply that the way the HR practices will be implemented by the team’s leader, is in line with what the HR department has intended with these practices.

### 5.4 Conclusion

With the use of the Social Learning Theory by Bandura (1977) and the Social Exchange Theory by Blau (1964) the relationships between employee perceptions of HRM, ethical leadership, collective efficacy and team-oriented commitment were explained. It was expected that ethical leadership would lead to increased levels of collective efficacy, which was not supported by the data. Besides, there was expected that ethical leadership would lead to increased levels of team-oriented commitment, which was not supported by the data as well. Perceived HRM was found to relate to collective efficacy and to team-oriented commitment. The mediating role of ethical leadership in these relations was not supported by the data. Perceptions of HRM and ethical leadership were found to be significantly related. This implies that when employees perceive HRM as positive, they will be more likely to give a higher rate to the level of ethical leadership. Further research on the interplay between leadership and HRM as well as on the effects of leadership and HRM on employee outcomes is needed. This research shows that an interplay exists between perceptions of HRM and ethical leadership. When the HR department and the managers collaborate, the outcomes will be synergetic.
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Appendix A
Questionnaires with relevant variables included

Vragenlijst

1. Wat is uw leeftijd? __________ jaar
2. Uw geslacht: □ Man □ Vrouw
3. Wat is uw hoogst genote afgeronde opleiding?
   □ WO □ VMBO
   □ HBO □ MBO
   □ VWO □ anders, namelijk __________
   □ HAVO
4. Hoe lang bent u werkzaam in uw huidige organisatie? __________ jaar
5. Bent u werkzaam in een team? □ Ja Ga naar vraag 6
   □ Nee Ga naar vraag 8
6. Hoeveel leden heeft uw team? __________ leden
7. Hoe lang bent u werkzaam in uw huidige team?
8. Op basis van welk type arbeidscontract bent u werkzaam?
   □ onbepaalde tijd contract □ bepaalde tijd contract
   □ anders, namelijk __________
9. Voor hoeveel uur per week heeft u een aanstelling? __________ uur
10. Hoelang bent u werkzaam voor uw huidige leidinggevende? __________ jaar
De volgende vragen hebben betrekking op de leidinggevende die u in uw dagelijks werk begeleidt en beoordeeld. Probeer tijdens het beantwoorden van de vragen deze leidinggevende in gedachte te houden. Geef aan in hoeverre onderstaande uitspraken van toepassing zijn.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Volledig mee</td>
<td>Mee oneens</td>
<td>Neutraal</td>
<td>Mee eens</td>
<td>Volledig mee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>oneens</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>eens</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Mijn leidinggevende...*

11 ..gedraagt zich ook buiten het werk op een ethische manier. 1 2 3 4 5
12 ..hanteert sancties als werknemers de ethische regels/procedures overtreden. 1 2 3 4 5
13 ..maakt bedrijfsethiek en bedrijfswaarden bespreekbaar onder werknemers. 1 2 3 4 5
14 ..luistert naar zijn/haar medewerkers. 1 2 3 4 5
15 ..handelt in het belang van zijn/haar medewerkers. 1 2 3 4 5
16 ..vraagt aan zijn/haar medewerkers "wat is de juiste manier om dit te doen?" als er een beslissing genomen moet worden. 1 2 3 4 5
17 ..definieert succes niet alleen als goede uitkomsten, maar ook als de manier waarop die worden bereikt. 1 2 3 4 5
18 ..is te vertrouwen. 1 2 3 4 5
19 ..geeft het goede voorbeeld van het ethische gedrag dat op het werk wordt verwacht. 1 2 3 4 5
20 ..maakt eerlijke en weloverwogen beslissingen. 1 2 3 4 5

21 Werknemers kunnen zonder overleg veranderingen aanbrengen in hun werkzaamheden. 1 2 3 4 5
22 Werknemers hebben werkzaamheden waarin zij zelf beslissingen mogen nemen. 1 2 3 4 5
23 Werknemers hebben een hoge mate van werkzekerheid in hun baan. 1 2 3 4 5
24 Werknemers voeren diverse en afwisselende taken uit. 1 2 3 4 5
25 De werknemers worden betrokken in taakroulatie. 1 2 3 4 5
<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>Het werving- en selectieproces zorgt ervoor dat meer medewerkers interne promotie kunnen krijgen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>Het werving- en selectieproces is gericht op het aannemen van de beste allround kandidaat, ongeacht de specifieke functie-eisen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>Het werving- en selectieproces is gericht op wat medewerkers kunnen aan onze strategische doelen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>Het werving- en selectieproces benadrukt sterk de mogelijkheid tot leren voor medewerkers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>Wij bieden een veelomvattend pakket trainingen voor onze medewerkers aan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>Wij scholen/trainen onze medewerkers voortdurend.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>Onze trainingsactiviteiten voor werknemers vereisen intensieve geld- en tijdsinvesteringen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>Onze trainingen proberen op korte termijn de productiviteit te verhogen</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>Onze trainingsactiviteiten trachten organisatie specifieke vaardigheden en/of kennis te ontwikkelen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>Prestatiebeoordelingen voor werknemers zijn gebaseerd op input van meerdere bronnen (collega’s, managers, enz.).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>Prestatiebeoordelingen benadrukken het leren van werknemers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>Prestatiebeoordelingen zijn gefocust op de bijdrage van werknemers aan onze strategische doelen.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>Prestatiebeoordelingen voor werknemers bevatten feedback over hun ontwikkeling.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>Beloningen zijn primair gericht op de korte termijn prestaties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>Beloningssystemen voor werknemers bevatten aantrekkelijke secundaire arbeidsvoorwaarden.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>De beloningen zijn afhankelijk van organisatie prestaties.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>Beloningen zetten medewerkers aan tot het bedenken van nieuwe ideeën.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>Ik ben bereid extra taken op me te nemen als dit ten goede komt aan mijn team.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>Ik voel me thuis bij mijn collega’s.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>Ik doe moeite om een goede sfeer in mijn team te behouden.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In mijn werk streef ik naar het behalen van teamdoelen.

Als er een sociale activiteit met mijn team plaatsvindt, help ik altijd met het organiseren hiervan.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Zeer onjuist</td>
<td>Onjuist</td>
<td>Een beetje onjuist</td>
<td>Een beetje juist</td>
<td>Juist</td>
<td>Zeer juist</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Denk aan de afdeling waarbij u werkzaam bent. Deze afdeling mag zijn een groep kantoormedewerkers, een onderhoudsploeg, een academisch departement, etc. Bij het invullen van de volgende vragen, antwoord in verwijzing naar de werk-gerelateerde bekwaamheid van deze afdeling. Geef aan in hoeverre u vindt dat de stelling toepasbaar is op uw afdeling.

1. De afdeling waarbij ik werkzaam ben, heeft een bovengemiddelde bekwaamheid.

2. Deze afdeling presteert slecht vergeleken met andere afdelingen waar hetzelfde werk wordt gedaan.

3. Deze afdeling is niet in staat om te presteren zoals het hoort.

4. De leden van deze afdeling hebben uitmuntende beroepsvaardigheden.

5. Sommige leden van deze afdeling zouden ontslagen moeten worden vanwege een tekort aan bekwaamheid.

6. Deze afdeling is niet erg effectief.

7. Sommige leden in deze afdeling kunnen hun werk niet goed doen.
Appendix B
Factor loadings

Table B1.

*Factor loadings from the PCA analysis of the Commitment HR Configuration scale.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Perceived HRM</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Werknemers kunnen zonder overleg veranderingen aanbrengen in hun werkzaamheden.</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Werknemers hebben werkzaamheden waarin zij zelf beslissingen mogen nemen.</td>
<td>.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Werknemers hebben een hoge mate van werkzekerheid in hun baan.</td>
<td>.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Werknemers voeren diverse en afwisselende taken uit.</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>De werknemers worden betrokken in taakroulatie.</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Het werving- en selectieproces zorgt ervoor dat meer medewerkers interne promotie kunnen krijgen.</td>
<td>.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Het werving- en selectieproces is gericht op het aannemen van de beste allround kandidaat, ongeacht de specifieke functie-eisen.</td>
<td>.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Het werving- en selectieproces is gericht op wat medewerkers kunnen bijdragen aan onze strategische doelen.</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Het werving- en selectieproces benadrukt sterk de mogelijkheid tot leren voor medewerkers.</td>
<td>.53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wij bieden een veelomvattend pakket trainingen voor onze medewerkers aan.</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wij scholen/trainen onze medewerkers voortdurend.</td>
<td>.73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onze trainingsactiviteiten voor werknemers vereisen intensieve geld- en tijdsinvesteringen.</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onze trainingen proberen op korte termijn de productiviteit te verhogen.</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Onze trainingsactiviteiten trachten de organisatiespecifieke vaardigheden en/of kennis te ontwikkelen.</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prestatiebeoordelingen voor werknemers zijn gebaseerd op input van meerdere bronnen (collega’s, managers, enz.)</td>
<td>.67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Prestatiebeoordelingen benadrukken het leren van werknemers.\textsuperscript{.65}

Prestatiebeoordelingen zijn gefocust op de bijdrage van werknemers aan onze strategische doelen.\textsuperscript{.44}

Prestatiebeoordelingen voor werknemers bevatten feedback over hun ontwikkeling.\textsuperscript{.64}

Beloningen zijn primair gericht op korte termijn prestaties.\textsuperscript{.75}

Beloningssystemen voor werknemers bevatten aantrekkelijke secundaire arbeidsvoorwaarden.\textsuperscript{.63}

De beloningen zijn afhankelijk van organisatieprestaties.\textsuperscript{.73}

Beloningen zetten medewerkers aan tot het bedenken van nieuw ideeën.\textsuperscript{.70}

\textit{Eigenwaarde} \textsuperscript{5.96}

\textit{KMO} \textsuperscript{.76}

\textit{Cronbach's }\alpha \textsuperscript{.85}

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\caption{TableB2. \textit{Factor loadings from the PCA analysis of the ethical leadership scale.}}
\begin{tabular}{ll}
\hline
\textbf{Scale} & \textbf{Ethical leadership} \\
\hline
Mijn leidinggevende … & \\
… gedraagt zich ook buiten het werk op een ethische manier. & .38 \\
.. hanteert sancties als werknemers de ethische regels/procedures overtreden. & .92 \\
… maakt bedrijfsethiek en bedrijfswaarden bespreekbaar onder werknemers. & .58 \\
… luistert naar zijn/haar medewerkers. & .72 \\
… handelt in het belang van zijn/haar medewerkers. & .72 \\
… vraagt aan zijn/haar medewerkers “wat is de juiste manier om dit te doen?” als er een beslissing genomen moet worden. & .49 \\
… definieert succes niet alleen als goede uitkomsten, maar ook als de manier waarop die worden bereikt. & .48 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\end{table}

… is te vertrouwen. .70
… geeft het goede voorbeeld van het ethische gedrag dat op het werk wordt verwacht. .70
… maakt eerlijke en weloverwogen beslissingen. .70

_Eigenwaarde_ 5.34
_KMO_ .89
_Cronbach’s α_ .89

Table B3.
*Factor loadings from the PCA analysis of the team-oriented commitment scale.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scale</th>
<th>Team-oriented commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ik ben bereid extra taken op me te nemen als dit ten goede komt aan mijn team.</td>
<td>.87</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ik voel me thuis bij mijn collega’s.</td>
<td>.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ik doe moeite om een goede sfeer in mijn team te behouden.</td>
<td>.83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>In mijn werk streef ik naar het behalen van teamdoelen.</td>
<td>.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Als er een sociale activiteit plaatsvindt, help ik altijd met het organiseren hiervan.</td>
<td>.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

_Eigenwaarde_ 4.12
_KMO_ .85
_Cronbach’s α_ .95

Table B4.
*Factor loadings from the PCA analysis of the Collective Efficacy Beliefs scale (ECBS).*
De afdeling waarbij ik werkzaam ben, heeft een bovengemiddelde bekwaamheid. \( .74 \)

Deze afdeling presteert slecht vergeleken met andere afdelingen waar hetzelfde werk wordt gedaan. \( .85 \)

Deze afdeling is niet in staat om te presteren zoals het hoort. \( .83 \)

De leden van deze afdeling hebben uitmuntende beroepsvaardigheden. \( .76 \)

Sommige leden van deze afdeling zouden ontslagen moeten worden vanwege een tekort aan bekwaamheid. \( .80 \)

Deze afdeling is niet erg effectief. \( .82 \)

Sommige leden in deze afdeling kunnen hun werk niet goed doen. \( .75 \)

**Eigenwaarde** \( 5.54 \)

**KMO** \( .90 \)

**Cronbach’s α** \( .96 \)