Leadership and Moral Behavior

3

Timothy Ewest

Abstract

Even though leadership theories are diverse, one notable commonality among leadership theories is that they inculcate the importance of moral behavior. This chapter explores moral leadership by providing brief contextual considerations regarding morals, outlines the most commonly used moral theories, examines each moral theory's strength and weakness, discusses the connection between moral theories and leadership theories by examining contextual considerations for the discussion, and discusses the central role of pro-social values in both morals and leadership theories, and then the chapter resolves with a case study and a simple moral test. This chapter will promote the idea that moral leaders act in ways that seek the welfare of others, even at personal cost.

Leadership and Moral Behavior

Leadership research has advanced greatly in the last 30 years although not in the same direction (Yukl, 1989). There are a multiplicity of leadership theories ranging from trait based, leadership style, and leadership situation and are representative of various perspectives on leadership. The great divergences in leadership theory speak to the vast new territory yet to be discovered. However, recent research by Hernaandez, Eberly, Avolio, and Johnson (2011) has begun to understand how these various leadership theories correspond and are even interrelated and complementary. One notable commonality among leadership theories is they inculcate the

T. Ewest (✉)
Houston Baptist University, Archie Dunham School of Business,
7502 Fondren Road, Houston, TX 77074-3298, USA
e-mail: tewest@hbu.edu; tim.ewest@gmail.com

J. Marques, S. Dhiman (eds.), *Leadership Today*, Springer Texts
in Business and Economics, DOI 10.1007/978-3-319-31036-7_3

importance of moral behavior (Ciulla, 2001; Johnson, 2013; Kanungo, 2001; Treviño, Brown, & Hartman, 2003). However, moral behavior is anchored within a specific set of human values and provides the motivation for moral pro-social behavior (Rokeach, 1973; Schwartz, 1994). Simply, if you scratch the surface of many leadership theories, you will find morals, but if you scratch the surface of morals, you find a central desire by researchers and theorists to center leadership theories on helping others (pro-social action).

This chapter explores moral leadership by providing brief contextual considerations regarding morals, outlines the most commonly used moral theories, examines each moral theory's strength and weakness, discusses the connection between moral theories and leadership theories by examining contextual considerations for the discussion, and discusses the central role of pro-social values in both morals and leadership theories, and then the chapter resolves with a case study and a simple moral test. This chapter will promote the idea that moral leaders act in ways that seek the welfare of others, even at personal cost.

Contextual Considerations Regarding Moral Theories

The first contextual consideration is the terms commonly used in this field of study. Two terms have been commonly used within this field, "morals" and "ethics." "Ethics" typically refers to innate knowledge of right/wrong, transcending culture, religion, and time. "Morals" typically refers to culturally and religiously based distinctions of right/wrong (Stackhouse, 1995). Both of these terms are derived from the Latin and Greek words for "customs." Beyond their common etymological origin, both ethics and morals are concerned with the expectations of how individuals ought to live (Gill, 2014; Stackhouse, 1995). In this chapter we are going to use the term "moral(s)" as a representative for both terms.

A second contextual consideration is the diverse sources drawn upon in the formation of moral theories such as religious texts, reason, cultural exchanges, and emotions. These sources contribute to moral theories and in turn to the formulation of the individual or personal obligations or "oughts." Third, when the considerations of how a person ought to live are within the context of a specific profession, role, or responsibility, then these considerations are regarded as applied ethics (Stackhouse, 1995). Finally, moral considerations can emphasize the individual, community, society, or culture. Within this contextual framework, ethical theories have been established and have acted as foundational elements to societies, communities, and individuals.

Moral Theories

The presence of moral theories extends far back into history and is as wide ranging as the variety of sources from which they are derived. However, Stackhouse (1995) provides a helpful rubric to classify moral theories by referencing the everyday

Table 3.1 Deontological, teleological, and ethological moral philosophy

Moral concepts	Established moral subdisciplines	Established moral theories
The **right** thing to do asks "what are the overarching universal principles and our duty to these principles?"	**Deontological** morals argue that we are to make decision based on duty	Kantian Religious
The **good** thing to do asks "what is the purpose or goal?"	**Teleological** morals focus on ends or goals that ought to be sought	Utilitarianism Social contract
The **fitting** thing to do asks "what is happening in this particular situation?"	**Ethological** morals are concerned with specific individuals and/or within specific settings	Virtue Ethical egoism

questions people ask when trying to determine their moral obligations. Stackhouse suggests three concepts, the right, the good, and the fitting. The right concerns itself with universal principles and our duty to those principles. The good is concerned with the purpose or goal within or concerned with moral action. The fitting is what is expected ought or obligation in a particular situation. Each of these concepts is related to established subdisciplines with moral philosophy and established moral theories. The subdisciplines are deontological moral philosophy (the right) which concerns itself with our duty toward universal principles, teleological moral philosophy (the good) which concerns itself with end goals or purposes, and ethology moral philosophy (the fitting) which concerns itself with specific individuals and/or within specific settings (Gill, 2014; Stackhouse, 1995); see Table 3.1. This heuristic is important because classical moral theories provide theoretical support for numerous leadership theories.

A number of moral theories, as suggested earlier, are expansive, yet there remain a select group of moral theories which are commonly used within the discussion of morality, and many act as a theoretical anchor for numerous leadership theories. What follows is a brief overview of the most common moral theories with an evaluation of their strengths and weaknesses.

Kantian moral theory is deontological in orientation, meaning this moral theory asks individuals to do their duty and obey universal principles, without regard to feelings. This moral philosophy was first proposed by Immanuel Kant. For example, if a person is motivated by the feeling of compassion and decides to help an elderly neighbor rake their yard, Kantian moral theory would not consider this a good moral act. Or, for example, if a person were to decide to help an elderly neighbor rake their yard because the person was hoping the elderly neighbor will tell the other neighbors about the kind act, again this is not considered a moral act. In both cases, a person is acting on feelings or inclinations, and doing this jeopardizes moral action. Why? The feeling when acted on rewards the person for their action in either giving them personal gain or resulting in personal loss, so the moral action is always considered in regard to consequences and therefore is contingent. Instead, when someone acts based only on their moral reason and duty, they disregard consequences (Johnson, 2014).

While acting without regard to feeling or without regard to consequences may be difficult, a bigger challenge may be finding the correct universal principle to obey. So how does one determine the universal principle to obey? Kant provided a heuristic known as the categorical imperative, which states, "Act only according to that maxim whereby you can at the same time will that it should become a universal law" (Patron, 1971, p. 136). What Kant is saying is, if you choose to act and consider it the morally good thing to do, it should be considered a universal law—you would expect everyone else to make exactly the same decision in this situation. Ultimately, this creates specific principles or rules which are the right thing to do in every circumstance such as honesty (Johnson, 2014; Cahn & Markie, 2011).

Workplace Example of Kantian Moral Theory

An individual in a leadership position finds out an employee has been lying about the reasons he has been late for work, citing an ill family member.

The leader responds within the Kantian theory if they say, "It is wrong to lie and you will be reprimanded. Because I am always honest with you and I expect the same from every employee."

Religious moral theory is also deontological in orientation, in that it is the individual's duty to obey universal principles. Yet, these universal principles are not determined by a person's reason; instead, they are representative of God's will for his creation. The response for many religiously devoted is to understand God's will through various means in which God has revealed himself (e.g., the Ten Commandments, Sacred Scriptures, Christ, etc.) and then to obey what God wants. Religious moral theory is very complex, at many times comprising elements of deontological, theological, and applied moral philosophies (Warburton, 2012). Moreover, for many religious people, obeying God is an act of devotion tied to their personal identity. As such, the religiously devoted choose to act morally; they do so as a means to preserve or enhance fundamental aspects of their identity, specifically who they are as people and where they belong (Ewest, 2015). Whatever the motivation, for the religiously devoted, moral actions are in reference to what God's expectations or will is for their behavior. For the religiously devoted, the universal principle and the character of God are one and the same (Gill, 2014).

Workplace Example of Religious Moral Theory

An individual in a leadership position finds out an employee has been lying about the reasons he has been late for work, citing an ill family member.

The leader responds within the religious theory if they say, "It is wrong to lie and you will be reprimanded. God has commanded us to be honest and we are not to disobey his will."

Table 3.2 Strengths and weaknesses of deontological philosophies

Concepts	Strengths	Weakness
The right	Answers the question, "what are the overarching universal principles and our duty to these principles?"	
	• These ethics provide a clear understanding of our moral obligations, by creating norms or rules to follow	
	• These ethics promote consistency in decisions	
The good		Leaves unanswered the question, "what is the purpose or goal in this moral behavior and what will be the result?"
		• Leaves consequences and results unaddressed
The fitting		Leaves unanswered the question, "what is happening in this particular situation?"
		• Disregards differences between situations and individuals

Strengths and weaknesses of deontological philosophies are important to consider. Deontological or duty-based moral theories do a good job of creating rules everyone can follow as well as promoting consistency in decisions, but do a poor job of addressing consequences, and they disregard individual situations; see Table 3.2.

Utilitarianism moral theory clearly thinks about consequences or the goal of moral behavior, thus making it a moral philosophy that should be considered teleological. Two philosophers are typically associated with this moral philosophy, John Stuart Mill and Jeremy Bentham. Both understood that the goal of human activity is to act in such a way as to bring about the greatest amount of human happiness. Both of them argue that the best moral decisions are ones that result in decisions that generate the most good or benefit for the greatest amount of people. The utility (usefulness) or good can either be applied to a specific situation or what is best in most contexts, thus creating a rule for those situations. The challenge with this moral theory is to determine whether the potential outcomes of an action will create benefits or negative consequences (Driver, 2014; Cahn & Markie, 2011; Warburton, 2012).

Workplace Example of Utilitarianism Moral Theory

An individual in a leadership position finds out an employee has been lying about the reasons he has been late for work, citing an ill family member.

The leader responds within the utilitarianism theory if they say, "It is wrong to lie and you will be reprimanded, because when you lie and come into work late, the whole group suffers because they have to work harder."

Social contract moral theory[1] also considers an end goal or state and therefore is also a teleological philosophy. One of the first to espouse this moral perspective was Thomas Hobbes, who was convinced that humans were self-centered. Hobbes also believed that each person has the right to preserve their own existence and will not do anything which destroys themselves. However, man has the right to harm others if others keep him from surviving. Individuals are able to overthrow others because individuals are equal to each other, meaning each person has gifts which can be used to overthrow the other person. For example, a strong person may be killed in his sleep by a smart person, and the smart person may be overtaken by a popular person who can rally friends. However, there is a problem if every person is equally justified to pursue their self-interests, and if each person can harm the other, the danger is that incivility will result. The solution is for people to use reason and realize the only option is to suspend the right to harm others. The individual then must give up their rights and turn their rights over to a sovereignty (state or government) which protects them from harming each other. Therefore, peace is maintained through laws enforced by appointed sovereign rules. This agreement by individuals is known as a social contract (Lloyd & Sreedhar, 2014).

> Workplace Example of Social Contract Moral Theory
>
> An individual in a leadership position finds out an employee has been lying about the reasons he has been late for work, citing an ill family member.
>
> The leader responds within the social contract theory if they say, "It is wrong to lie and you will be reprimanded, because when you lie and come into work late, you are harming others and if I don't stop it, everyone will show up late and create chaos."

Strengths and weaknesses of teleological moral philosophies are important to consider. Teleological or purpose-based moral theories do a good job of finding the most benefit for the greatest number of people and also do a good job of analyzing a particular situation but do a poor job of creating general rules to follow in the future, and it can be inconsistent when using the same criteria and ignores individual situations; see Table 3.3.

Virtue moral theory is a moral theory that should be regarded as ethology, since it considers how a particular person ought to act within a situation. This moral theory is largely based on Aristotle's (Irwin, 1999) Nicomachean Ethics. Unlike deontological and teleological moral philosophies, ethology typically concerns itself with particular individual actions or individual situations. Virtue theory desires actions which allow an individual's life to flourish. The individual ought to choose in their life situations or actions which agree with the intended design of their human nature and act in ways as to enrich this nature (also regarded as their character). The human design can either be thought of as coming from a creator or from natural selection (evolution). Since the person has to choose to do right, it is assumed by virtue theorists that the

[1] Most regard social contract theory as a political philosophy.

Table 3.3 Strengths and weaknesses of teleological moral philosophies

Concepts	Strengths	Weakness
The right		Leaves unanswered "what are the overarching universal principles and our duty to these principles?"
		• No general normative rule created
		• Inconsistency in decisions
The good	Answers the question, "what is the purpose or goal in this moral behavior and what will be the result?"	
	• Finds the most beneficial result for the particular situation	
The fitting	Answers the question, "what is happening in this particular situation?"	Leaves unanswered the question, "what is happening in this particular individual?"
	• Considers differences between situations	• Disregards differences between individuals

virtues, or morally right choices, are not innate (Hursthouse, 2013; Russell, 2013; Skyrms, 1996; Warburton, 2012).

Workplace Example of Virtue Moral Theory

An individual in a leadership position finds out an employee has been lying about the reasons he has been late for work, citing an ill family member.

The leader responds within the virtue theory if they say, "It is wrong to lie and you will be reprimanded, because when you lie you make me question the type of person you are wanting to become and you are sure to limit yourself."

Egoism moral theory is part of the philosophy of ethology. An egoist assumes, much like in social contract theorist, that humans will act in regard to their own self-interest. But, more importantly, an action is only considered morally right when it is done with a person's own self-interest in mind. Yet, egoists do consider others in their actions. For them, if they were to hurt or betray others, it may not be in their best interest, since they may be harmed in return; therefore, egoists will help others, when it helps them (Shaver, 2015).

Workplace Example of Ethical Egoism Moral Theory

An individual in a leadership position finds out an employee has been lying about the reasons he has been late for work, citing an ill family member.

The leader responds within the virtue theory if they say, "It is wrong to lie and you will be reprimanded, because when you lie and come into work late, you are harming others and they will harm you in return—watch out!"

Table 3.4 Strengths and weaknesses of ethological philosophies

Concepts	Strengths	Weakness
The right		Leaves unanswered the question, "what are the overarching universal principles and our duty to these principles?"
		• No general normative rule created
		• Inconsistency in decisions
The good		Leaves unanswered the question, "what is the purpose or goal in this moral behavior and what will be the result?"
		• Leaves consequences and results unaddressed
The fitting	Answers the question, "what is happening in this particular situation?"	
	• Considers differences between situations and the individuals	

Strengths and weaknesses of ethological philosophies are important to consider. Ethological or situation or individual-based moral theories do a good job of paying attention to the concerns of an individual within a given situation, but do a poor job of considering the consequences of decisions, are inconsistent when applied to a similar situation, and don't provide a universal rule to follow in the future; see Table 3.4.

These moral theories are important, but how are they used or connected with leadership theories? Is there a leadership theory that is purely ethical in nature?

Contextual Considerations Regarding Moral Leadership

Again, there are some contextual considerations which will set the context for the discussion about moral leadership. First, to be considered a leader, one does not have to be morally good. Adolf Hitler, Benito Mussolini, Pol Pot, and Jim Jones are all examples of people who were considered leaders (at least by their followers), but are also remembered as being immoral. Yet, at the same time, an "immoral leader" can be for many a contradiction in terms. To be certain, the connection between morals and leadership is not apparent. In fact, it is only in the last 30–40 years that scholarship has begun to seriously explore the role morals play in the lives of leaders.

Second, it is important to understand that there is no unified "moral leadership theory," that is, no leadership theory that directly corresponds to any of the aforementioned moral theories.[2] Next, when leadership literature refers to "moral leaders," the literature is not referring to any specific leadership theory; instead, it

[2] With the possible exception of virtue moral theory

typically refers to a leader who is acting in ways that are morally good. Specifically, it is suggesting that the leader is following good universal principles, seeking good outcomes for the group, or making good choices in regard to their character. Fourth, there are commonalities among leadership theories regarding morals. One notable commonality largely accepted among leadership theorists is that most leadership theories inculcate the importance of moral behavior (Ciulla, 2001; Johnson, 2013; Kanungo, 2001; Treviño et al., 2003). Fifth, Northhouse (2015) suggests that moral leadership "Theories can be thought of as falling within two broad domains: theories about leaders' conduct and theories about leadership character" (p. 424). Finally, another connection leadership theories have in common is pro-social values, and these pro-social values are the essence of others' directed selfless moral action found in multiple moral theories as well as leadership theories (Ewest, 2015). Pro-social values emphasize concern for others' welfare, even at personal cost.

Pro-social Values and Leadership Theories

Trying to determine a single commonality among the various moral theories and then applying those commonalities to leadership theory are challenging and potentially impossible. However, as mentioned earlier, Northhouse (2015) presents the most common method, that being reducing moral theories to moral principles that are present in leadership theories. The problem with doing this is that it aligns itself largely with deontological moral philosophies that look for universal principles and ignores teleological philosophy that seeks good outcomes for the group and ethology which considers individual's particular situation. An alternative is to frame the connection between morals and leadership theory with the moral framework of pro-social values.

Pro-social values of empathy and altruism are present in a leader's moral action. An empathetic act ensures the welfare of others in everyday life by progressing toward one's own goals without violating the justified goals of others, because the person desires to remain in harmony with others (Beirhoff, 2002; Beirhoff, Klien, & Kramp, 1991; Hastings, Zahn-Waxler, Robinson, Usher, & Bridges, 2000; Omoto & Snyder, 1995). An altruistic act is devoid of self-consideration, focusing solely on the goals or needs of others alone (Beirhoff, 2002). Empathy and altruism are necessary components of pro-social behavior. Simply stated, when leaders are acting pro-socially, they act in ways that seek the welfare of others, even at personal cost.

Avolio and Locke (2002) suggest "The most effective moral leaders are those who transcend their own interests for the good of their group, organization or society" (p. 228). Numerous leadership theories emphasize others' directed behavior containing both empathy and altruism, which are also vital components of numerous moral theories. For example, one of the first leadership scholars, Burns (1978), conceptualized leadership as being centered on others or directed to public interest, this type of leadership he referred to as transformational leadership. Greenleaf 1997 understood leadership as service to others, which he called servant leadership.

Table 3.5 Leadership theories emphasizing empathy and altruism

Leadership theory	Ways they incorporate empathy or altruism
Transformational leadership	Burns argued transformational leaders empower, listen, and help communities to become self-sustaining (p. 37)
Servant leadership	"Make sure that others people's highest priority needs are being served" (Greenleaf, 1997, p.7)
Authentic leadership	"Service before self; mission and the organization supersede self-interest" (George, 2003)
Social exchange	"Understanding perspectives other than your own is a crucial component to participating in the community" (Komives & Wagner, 2012, p. 165)
Spiritual leadership	Altruistic love is a sense of wholeness, harmony, and well-being produced through care, concern, and appreciation for both self and others (Fry, 2003)

Authentic leadership (George, 2003) asks leaders to be true to their own moral code and in doing this put others first. Social exchange theory asks individuals to be pay close attention to their own moral code and pay close attention to the perspectives of those that follow them (Komives & Wagner, 2012). Finally, Fry's (2003) theory of spiritual leadership asks individuals to lead by their concern for others which produces harmony; see Table 3.5. Since the time of Burns, numerous scholars have included others' directed behavior as a vital aspect of leadership theory (Avolio & Locke, 2002; Grant, 2012).

Moral Decision and Leading Morally

Since pro-social behaviors are important components to moral theory as well as leadership theory, they provide good biases for evaluating if leadership decisions are moral. Moral decision-making models or processes all contend for a central and dominate role of reason or cognition to make appropriate moral decisions (Kidder, 1995; Ulrich, 2002). Even though some moral theories consider reason to be less central, almost every moral theory uses reason as a component to determine the best moral course.

While every individual adheres to a different moral theory, every individual can incorporate pro-social values within their moral leadership decisions. If a leader can ask a few simple questions before making a decision, it would help to ensure that leadership decisions include moral concerns. The following case study and questions are designed to incorporate all aspects of moral philosophy (deontological, teleological, and ethological), answering the questions what is right, what is good, and what is fitting as well as considering if those decisions act in ways that seek the welfare of others, even at personal cost (pro-social values).

Case Study 3.1: Aspects of Moral Philosophy

Chris has been asked to manage a group of employees at an accounting firm. Every morning Chris arrives early to prepare for the day and make sure everything is ready so the employees have the best support possible. Today is no exception.

As the employees arrive Chris takes note of the time each employee arrives, as he has been instructed to do by superiors. Chris notes that one employee, Pat, has not shown up on time, but it is not unusual. Pat has a history of not showing up to work on time, and according to the company policy, if Pat is late two more times, Pat will be reported. If Pat is reported to the upper management, he will face demotion or termination. Chris approaches Pat to inquire why he is late again.

Pat looks tired, as if he has not had enough sleep, and looks much thinner than the last time Chris saw him. Pat is calm now, but has been known to have mood swings ranging from violent to passive. Chris is hoping the conversation will be civil. After being asked "why he was late," Pat responds that a sick family member has taken more energy than expected and he simply could not leave his loved one in the condition they were in—so he was late. Pat apologizes profusely and says he will try and not let it happen again.

As Chris goes back to the work desk to record the occurrence, a coworker interrupts and says he knows Pat is lying. The coworker walks to work and stops at a coffee shop an hour before work. Every morning this coworker sees Pat across the street at a café talking with someone. The coworker notes that conversations are intense, and many times they have seen Pat in tears. But Pat is only two blocks away from work and should be able to make it to work on time.

Chris is incensed and wants to confront Pat. As Chris goes back to the supervisor's desk and contemplates what to do next, Chris realizes that Pat is demonstrating all the behaviors of drug or substance abuse that a recent supervisor training addressed. Chris is uncertain what to do.

Simple Moral Test

Before you continue reading, go back and look at moral theories mentioned in this chapter and see which ones you identify with the most. Are the theories you identify with deontological, teleological, or ethological? Remember, each moral theory by itself leaves moral questions unanswered, and the goal would be to draw from each of these moral philosophies. Moreover, moral decisions that are pro-social also have care for the welfare of the other and are selfless acts. Next, make a decision on the case above by putting yourself in the position of Chris; what would you decide and why? Then review Table 3.6 and see if your solution passes the moral test.

Table 3.6 Moral test

Ask yourself the following questions:	
Pro-social questions	Moral philosophy concepts
Does my decision reference a universal principle such as benevolence, care, and empathy, and does the proposed solution illustrate this principle and create a rule that can be used later in a similar situation?	The right—deontology "What are the overarching universal principles and our duty to these principles?"
Does the moral decision being made allow me or the organization to pursue its goals without interfering with the goals of the other? If the answer is "yes," does it indicate that the action may be pro-social?	The good—teleology "What is the purpose or goal" in this moral behavior; what will be the result?
Would the person who is being acted up consider this action caring? If not, is the action in their best interest?	The fitting—ethology
Do I personally gain from this action?	"What is happening in this particular situation?"

Conclusion

This chapter explored moral leadership by providing brief contextual considerations regarding morals, outlining the most commonly used moral theories, and examining each moral theory's strength and weakness, discussed the connection between moral theories and leadership theories by providing contextual considerations for the discussion, and discussed the central role of pro-social values in both morals and leadership theories, and then the chapter resolved with a case study and a simple moral test.

Moral leaders act in ways that seek the welfare of others, even at personal cost. One of the best examples of a moral leader within this last century is the late Nelson Mandela. Nelson Mandela was born in 1918 in South Africa, which was a racially segregated country. Mandela spent his life fighting for the equal rights of South African Blacks, the democracy for South Africa, and the elimination of poverty. Mandela spent years of his life in prison for his activism, but eventually was freed, and his activism and leadership won him a Nobel Prize, and in May 1996 Nelson was elected president of South Africa (Nelson Mandela, 2015). When asked what leadership meant to him, Nelson Mandela responded, "Real leaders must be ready to sacrifice all for the freedom of their people" (Burford, 2014, p. 4). Moral leaders act in ways that seek the welfare of others, even at personal cost.

Chapter Summary

- Discussion of most commonly used moral theories evaluating their strengths and weaknesses;
  - Kantian moral theory is deontological in orientation, meaning this moral theory asks individuals to do their duty and obey universal principles, without regard to feelings.
  - Religious moral theory is also deontological in orientation, in that it is the individual's duty to obey universal principles. Yet, these universal principles are not determined by a person's reason; instead, they are representative of God's will for his creation.
  - Utilitarianism moral theory thinks about consequences or the goal of moral behavior, thus making it a moral philosophy that should be considered teleological.
  - Social contract moral theory also considers an end goal or state and therefore is also a teleological philosophy.
  - Virtue moral theory is a moral theory that should be regarded as ethology, since it considers how a particular person ought to act within a situation.
  - Egoism moral theory is part of the philosophy of ethology. An egoist assumes, much like in social contract theorist, that humans will act in regard to their own self-interest.
- Examination of the central role of pro-social values in leadership theories.
- Moral leaders act in ways that seek the welfare of others, even at personal cost.
- Case study as a means to assess personal moral leadership choices.
- Moral test to determine if leadership decisions are moral.

Discussion Questions

1. Think of those individuals in your life you consider to be leaders. Are these individuals to act in the best interest of others and willing to sacrifice for others? If you answered "yes," would you still admire them if they ceased being pro-social?
2. Do you think it is possible for a leader to act selfishly and still be morally good? If you answered "yes," what would be those conditions? If you answered "no," why is this not possible?
3. What moral theories do you see at use most often in the workplace and in leadership? Why do you think this is the case?

References

Avolio, B. J., & Locke, E. E. (2002). Contrasting different philosophies of leader motivation: Altruism versus egoism. *The Leadership Quarterly, 13*(2), 169–191.

Beirhoff, H. W. (2002). *Social psychology: A modular course (pro-social behavior)*. New York: Psychology Press.

Beirhoff, H. W., Klien, R., & Kramp, P. (1991). Evidence for the altruistic personality from data on accident research. *Journal of Personality, 59*, 263–280.

Burford, N. (2014). *Decolonizing pedagogy: Critical consciousness and its impact on schooling for black students (Doctoral dissertation)*. Toronto: University of Toronto, College of Humanities.

Burns, J. M. (1978). *Leadership New York*. NY: Harper and Row Publishers.

Cahn, S., & Markie, P. (2011). *Ethics: History, theory, and contemporary issues*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Ciulla, J. B. (2001). Carving leaders from the warped wood of humanity. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences/Revue Canadienne des Sciences de l'Administration, 18*(4), 313–319.

Driver, J. (2014). The history of utilitarianism. In Edward N. Zalta (Ed.) *The stanford encyclopedia of philosophy* (Winter Edition). Retrieved from http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/win2014/entries/utilitarianism-history.

Ewest, T. (2015a). Transformational leadership practices and global social responsibility. *Journal of Leadership Studies, 9*(3), 19–27.

Ewest, T. (2015). Christian identity as the primary foundation to workplace ethics. *Religions,* (2015), 12.

Fry, L. W. (2003). Toward a theory of spiritual leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly, 14*(6), 693–727.

George, B. (2003). *Authentic leadership: Rediscovering the secrets to creating lasting value*. New York: Wiley.

Gill, R. (2014). *A textbook of christian ethics*. London, UK: Bloomsbury.

Grant, A. (2012). Leading with meaning: Beneficiary contact, prosocial impact, and the performance effects of transformational leadership. *Academy of Management Journal, 55*(2), 458–476.

Greenleaf, R. K. (1997). *The servant as leader*. University of Notre Dame Press.

Hastings, P. D., Zahn-Waxler, C., Robinson, J., Usher, B., & Bridges, D. (2000). The development of concern for others in children with behavior problems. *Developmental Psychology, 36*, 531–546.

Hernaandez, M., Eberly, M., Avolio, B., & Johnson, M. (2011). The loci and mechanisms of leadership: Exploring a more comprehensive leadership theory. *The Leadership Quarterly, 22*, 1165–1185.

Hursthouse, R. (2013). "Virtue Ethics". In Edward N. Zalta (Ed.) *The stanford encyclopedia of philosophy* (Fall Edition). Retrieved from http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/fall2013/entries/ethics-virtue.

Irwin, T. (1999). *Aristotle, Nicomachean ethics*. Indianapolis: Hackett.

Johnson, C. E. (2013). *Meeting the ethical challenges of leadership: Casting light or shadow*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Johnson, R. (2014). Kant's moral philosophy. In Edward N. Zalta (Ed.) *The stanford encyclopedia of philosophy* (Summer Edition). Retrieved from http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/sum2014/entries/kant-moral.

Kanungo, R. N. (2001). Ethical values of transactional and transformational leaders. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences/Revue Canadienne des Sciences de l'Administration, 18*(4), 257–265.

Kidder, R. M. (1995). *How good people make tough choices: Resolving the dilemmas of ethical living*. New York: Fireside.

Komives, S. R., & Wagner, W. (2012). *Leadership for a better world: Understanding the social change model of leadership development*. New York: Wiley.

Lloyd, S., & Sreedhar, S. (2014). Hobbes's moral and political philosophy. In Edward N. Zalta (Ed.) *The stanford encyclopedia of philosophy* (Spring Edition). Retrieved from http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2014/entries/hobbes-moral.

Nelson Mandela. (2015). In *Encyclopædia Britannica*. Retrieved from http://www.britannica.com/EBchecked/topic/361645/Nelson-Mandela.

Northhouse, P. (2015). *Leadership: Theory and practice*. Thousand Oaks: Sage.

Omoto, A. M., & Snyder, M. (1995). Sustained helping without obligation: Motivation, longevity of service, and perceived attitude change among AIDS volunteers. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 68*, 671–686.

Patron, H. (1971). *The categorical imperative: A study in Kant's moral philosophy*. Pennsylvania: University of Pennsylvania Press.

Rokeach, M. (1973). *The nature of human values*. New York: Free Press.

Russell, D. (2013). *The Cambridge companion to virtue ethics (Cambridge companions to philosophy)*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Schwartz, S. (1994). Are there universal aspects in the structure and contents of human values? *Journal of Social Issues, 50*(4), 19–45.

Shaver, R. (2015). "Egoism". In Edward N. Zalta (Ed.) *The stanford encyclopedia of philosophy* (Spring Edition). Retrieved from http://plato.stanford.edu/archives/spr2015/entries/egoism.

Skyrms, B. (1996). *Evolution of the social contract*. New York: Cambridge University Press.

Stackhouse, M. (1995). Introductions foundations and purpose. In M. Stackhouse, D. McCann, S. Roels, & P. Williams (Eds.), *On moral business: Classical and contemporary resources for ethics in economic life*. Grand Rapids, MI: Wm. B. Eerdmans.

Treviño, L. K., Brown, M., & Hartman, L. P. (2003). A qualitative investigation of perceived executive ethical leadership: Perceptions from inside and outside the executive suite. *Human Relations, 56*(1), 5–37.

Ulrich, P. (2002). Ethics and economics. In L. Zsolnai (Ed.), *Ethics in the economy. Handbook of business ethics* (pp. 9–36). Bern: Peter Lang Academic.

Warburton, N. (2012). *Philosophy: The basics* (5th ed.). London, UK: Routledge.

Yukl, G. A. (1989). Managerial leadership: A review of theory and research. *Yearly Review of Management, 15*(4), 251–289.