

**Martina Šendula-Pavelić,<sup>1</sup> Igor Eterović<sup>2</sup>**

<sup>1</sup> University of Rijeka, Faculty of Health Studies, Department of Public Health

<sup>2</sup> University of Rijeka, Faculty of Medicine, Department of Social Sciences and Medical Humanities,  
Braće Branchetta 20, HR–51000 Rijeka

<sup>2</sup> igor.eterovic@umiri.hr

## **When Bioethicists “Walk the Talk”!**

### **The Integrative Role and Importance of Ethical Leadership in Bioethics**

#### **Abstract**

*There is probably no discipline which requires the element of activism and the need for provision of role models in normative issues than bioethics. The mere nature of this propulsive discipline theoretically, by promotion of interdisciplinarity, and practically, by addressing important ethical issues and striving to integrate all given perspectives including those effectively present in everyday life, points in that direction. Integrative bioethics is even more emphatic concerning the required integration of the mentioned perspectives. Ethical leadership is a content rich and norms-oriented concept which could play a fundamental role in finding a key of true integration of theory and practice of bioethics. There are almost no serious discussions and investigations of the possibilities of using the well elaborated psychological research on leadership for such purposes. This article should fill that gap providing conclusive evidence for identifying and illuminating the importance of ethical leadership in bioethical enterprises. Moreover, it is argued that without ethical leadership bioethicists can be suspected as losing the essence of their professional identity. In pointing to research addressing different aspects of ethical leadership we build a framework for the analogous leadership in the field of bioethics. By widening the theoretical framework with philosophical and psychological analysis we specify some necessary features for such a special kind of normative leadership. Finally, we argue that further dissemination of these ideas provides fruitful theoretical and practical grounds for the identification of these basic features of bioethical leadership as the most important standards of a bioethicist's work and behaviour.*

#### **Keywords**

bioethics, ethical leadership, integrative bioethics, psychology

“In its original incarnation, bioethics was intended to be ‘pro-active’ – using moral reflection to make the world a better place to live. In a world where corruption is a threat to human life and the source of much agony, suffering and death, bioethicists can and must play their roles in guiding the moral vision of medicine, a practice that is intricately connected with individual well-being and social good. There is no room for complacency – history will not forgive any such failure in moral duty.” (Chattopadhyay et al., 2012: p. 145)

## **Introduction: Extending or Just Revealing the Full Potential of Bioethics**

In today's world with the dynamics and participation of more and more people in all types of knowledge one could legitimately question the purpose, meaning and role of bioethics in contemporary society. After more than a

half century of “God’s committee” work in Seattle, which is usually taken as the birth of the discipline (see Jonsen, 1993; Jonsen, 1998), we could ask is it enough for bioethics to be primarily a spectator and commentator on those phenomena occurring in everyday life, or the time has come for bioethics to engage itself in “preventive” work articulating and leading the bioethical worldview. The critical potential of bioethics is without doubt a crucial feature of the bioethics’ enterprise and it has brought the discipline to a stage of extremely rapid development, but maybe it is not enough just to warn about things that have already happened or to guard on those things currently happening.<sup>1</sup>

Every field as it develops wants to retain its integrity and credibility and to maintain the trust of the public and those whom it addresses have to be reflective about the roles and values it promotes. Maturity implies the questioning of one’s own effectiveness, by raising the question whether it adequately recognizes the errors and failures committed while dealing with main topics of the field. Generally, those working in this area should reflect upon the ways that they deal with ethical concerns whilst carrying out their responsibilities. Most probably because of the nature of the issues that bioethics deals with and the gravity and implications of the actions that result, the contributions that bioethics and bioethicists make are more significantly pronounced than in other fields. Bioethicists seek to address public concerns, articulate ethical ideals and professional standards; even more, “they provide reason for people to think that bioethicists can improve the quality of thought and action” (Nelson, 2007: p. 54).

In becoming more independent and exercising greater influence and currently more relied on for ethical specialist expertise in different areas – from clinical research, government and legal matters, to corporate and community contexts – it becomes difficult to retain legitimacy and to defend or maintain integrity under diverse pressures present in different professional roles and environments (see Moreno, 2007). Critics notice topics being overlooked due to ideological biases or because of politicization, as well as bioethicists remaining silent or neutral on pressing matters which contribute to a loss of public trust and influence. We witness that today it becomes important not only to identify and direct reasoning towards conclusions about what is the best decision on important ethical issues, but it is extremely important also who makes these decisions and whether it resonates authentically. Bioethicists cannot afford to violate the trust of those who depend upon them as main carriers and models for acting ethically. Therefore, considering the constant new areas that require bioethics to respond and act, accompanied with challenges that can significantly undermine its influence as well as integrity, the field of bioethics needs to reassess the adequacy of the skills and the attendant obligations which accompany bioethicists’ roles.

We strongly believe that bioethics as a discipline has the unique potential to extend its efforts, and we will show that such potential is already present from its ‘founding fathers’ through the whole history of the discipline. To pose the question from the perspective of ethical theories, we could ask if it is time to rethink the focus of bioethics and if more importance should be given to development of appropriate skills and virtues, rather than focusing on precise rules or the measurement of good consequences. Nowadays bioethicists must heed the “call to be reflective about their roles and to rethink the well-worn and tired ideas of bioethics” (De Vries, 2007: p. 67).

We argue that bioethics could benefit from using the results of psychology research, especially in the domain of ethical leadership. But, before we take a closer examination of the fruitfulness of that concept, the normative nature and activist climate representing the two sides of one coin (implicated by the double face of bioethics as a discipline and a movement) should be presented as a firm basis for the implementation of ethical, and generally normative, leadership in bioethical contexts.

### **Not Only Academia: Bioethics as an Active and Propulsive Universal Enterprise**

At the beginning of Bioethics, as early as 1926, protestant pastor Fritz Jahr coined for the first time the term ‘bioethics’ (*Bio-Ethik*), but also envisaged – in his pastoral manner – a necessary active role of every agent for the realization and effectuation of the proposed Bioethical Imperative.<sup>2</sup> A founding father of the contemporary discipline, Van Rensselaer Potter, in his vision of Bioethics as a new science which should provide “a bridge to the future” calls explicitly for the bringing together of normative science and natural science (primarily biology), as the only way for responsible managing of modern science which otherwise starts to produce “a dangerous knowledge”. Such knowledge without responsible agent-scientists is a one-way road to global disaster and bioethics is identified as a key discipline for preventing such a scenario (see Potter, 1971).

The further development of bioethics generated complex questions about the nature of this new discipline (see Koppelman, 2002; Khushf, 2004; Engelhardt, 2012), but one feature of this new approach becomes more apparent: bioethics is not and should not be confined to standard academic discourses and by breaking the standard boundaries between different disciplines it is primarily devoted to active involvement in the resolution of the most challenging contemporary issues, being involved in the span of topics from the quality of medical care to environmental issues.<sup>3</sup>

One feature of the discipline should be especially highlighted: bioethical matters “have spread beyond the spheres of the contributing intellectual disciplines of which it is composed, and the professional milieus in which their members usually operate, to pervade in the public domain” (Fox & Swazey, 2008: p. 7). Bioethics became more than an academic field involving all

<sup>1</sup> The trend in primarily *judging*, instead of anticipating or *preventing* some problems in major part of bioethical community is highlighted very well in the work of British bioethical pioneer, Ian Kennedy who “condemned the English reluctance to do anything about the situation until it has caused difficulty and called for guidelines to prevent legal challenge” (Wilson, 2012: p. 198). This *legal* point of view on bioethics as a kind of *post festum* judge for contemporary problems, instead of utilizing *ethical* tools for orientation in solving future problems is one of the main motivations of this article.

<sup>2</sup> See particularly Jahr, [1935] (2012c) for his insistence of the connection between thought and action, but also Jahr, [1926] (2017), Jahr, [1927] (2012a), Jahr, [1928] (2012b) for his elaboration of Bioethical Imperative as a guiding principle for human’s action.

<sup>3</sup> The all four editions of *Encyclopedia of Bioethics* capture this horizon of issues, despite the fact that first edition was more oriented to issues closer to medical realm. See Reich (1978b), Reich (1995b), Post (2004b) and Jennings (2014b).

levels of society; it has always been a public movement while simultaneously developing as an academic and professional field (see Ozar, 2014).

### **Concept of Bioethics as a Challenge, not a Problem**

‘Bioethics’ is without a doubt one of the most popular and used word in contemporary discussions about normativity, mostly understood in the sense of direct inclusiveness in everyday life. However, there are quite a lot of different understandings of the origins, the scope and methods used in the field. While searching for the subject covered by bioethics we can find help in all four editions of the *Encyclopedia of Bioethics*, which univocally agree that bioethics is “systematic study” in the area “of the life sciences and health care” (Reich, 1978a: p. xxii; Reich, 1995a: p. xxi)<sup>4</sup>; it is not clear how it deals with such a broad subject. Briefly, even if we accept this broad definition of the subject, the methodology of bioethics remains obscure. The “official” definition, kept in two editions of the *Encyclopedia*, stated that in bioethics its subject should be studied by “employing a variety of ethical methodologies in an interdisciplinary setting” (see Reich, 1995b: p. xxi; Post, 2004a: p. xi). But extreme broadness in subject (life sciences connects almost every single science in some way) and methodological openness is generally understood as problematic. This is probably the main reason why so many authors still have strong scepticism about bioethics as special field of inquiry (see Baron, 2006: especially p. 4) and many of them often use that term as synonymous to (new) medical ethics (see Veatch, 2012, especially pp. 1–9), biomedical ethics (see Beauchamp & Childress, 2013), or applied ethics (see Singer, 2011),<sup>5</sup> trying to narrow down the discipline and thus apparently solving some of the problematic features concerning bioethics’ scope both in subject and methodology. As one of the most prominent historian of bioethics clearly pointed out:

“With the meaning and content of the field still being debated, scholarly discussion and public controversy has gone on for forty years, creating a large body of thought that can loosely be called a discipline or at least a field of study.” (Jonsen, 2014: p. 332)

Other authors see this broadness in scope as a primary and perhaps the most valuable bioethical feature. Accordingly, one way out from the bioethical dead end was found in the search for various common principles, norms, or values which can univocally be attributed to bioethics and bioethical ways of thinking or living, because there is a strong sense of conceiving bioethics as something deeply connected to respect for life and rooted in everyday life. These features can be generally thought of as some basic bioethical standards that are intended as general normative guidelines which can be theoretically sound enough, but practically operative to a maximal extent at the same time.<sup>6</sup> Despite our lack of confidence in the nature of bioethics (is it a field of work?, profession?, movement?), in its scope (is it better to be confined within medical ethics because of precision?), or is it better to conceive it as an amalgam of medical ethics, research ethics and environmental ethics because it covers the broad area of “life sciences”?), or in its methodology (is it a result of methodologies of different sciences, with obscure justification as its unique effort?, or does it have a unique methodology, with an unclear determination of such or, in the best case, just sketching some?), one thing is true: it is a growing field with a rising number of “bioethicists”. Thus, maybe it is more useful to focus on the question: “What does it mean to be a bioethicist?” and the answer

would bring us to a more or less clear view about bioethics itself. In trying to answer this question, the standards of bioethicists’ way of living pop out.

Some approaches, and here the integrative bioethics approach is a prime example, took the broadness of bioethical scope as an indicator of a much needed new discipline which will make an important qualitative step in facing the burdening issues of contemporaneity. Integrative bioethics is struggling with finding an adequate methodology which will be theoretically sound, but also practically applicable in dealing with all issues concerning *bios* – “life, life as a whole and each of its parts, life in all its forms, shapes, degrees, stages and manifestations” (Jurić, 2017: p. 132). Thus, it embraces the idea of maximal widening of the bioethical scope concerning the subject of study. Moreover, integrative bioethics are trying to widen the scope in methodology of bioethical study by testing some new methodological tools like concepts of (pluri)perspectivism and orientational knowledge (see contributions in Čović, 2011). The main challenge lies in integrating all relevant perspectives and promoting interconnection and interdependence respected via some more or less clear orientational set(s) of knowledge(s).

One way to meet that challenge is trying to specify and articulate some idea of a unique worldview, a bioethical one (see Zagorac, 2017). This idea has the potential to resolve some methodological issues, for at least two reasons. First, it brings an idea of the strong connection between theory and practices, between values and phenomenologies of their realisation, between professional and all other dimensions of persons’ lives. It is a kind of personal life philosophy demonstrated in all aspects of life, without the (or with a small) possibility of ignoring some deep values constituting the worldview in question. Some studies articulate this power of this special, genuine point of view, *Anschauung*, the fundamental orientation of our thoughts and heart (Sire, 2004). The process of articulating and defending such a worldview as bioethical will require a minimal intersubjective ground of general acceptance for all moral agents. Second, despite some minimal accepted grounds, these are articulated in terms of guidelines which are needed to give orientation: they should provide regulatory principles which will be the guiding norms of judging and acting (see Eterović, 2017: pp. 266–283). Such an approach leaves a significant space for every agent to manoeuvre in order to build their

4

In the third and fourth editions editors simply referred to both of these definitions of bioethics, but – what is quite interesting – Post leaned on the second Reich’s definition, and Jennings on the first Reich’s definition (see Post, 2004a: p. xi; Jennings, 2014a: p. xv).

5

Critical voices about scope, methodology and definition comes from the pen of the most prominent “bioethicists” spread throughout extensive bibliography.

6

We can try to locate those most general bioethical guidelines in the formulation of different normative imperatives: from Bioethical Imperative of Fritz Jahr and Imperative of Responsibility of Hans Jonas to specific ecological imperative of Aldo Leopold (see Jahr,

[1926], 2017: p. 18; Jahr, [1927], 2012a: p. 4; Jahr, [1928], 2012b: p. 12; Jonas, 1984: p. 11; Leopold, 1949: pp. 224–225). The guidelines are also have been given by postulating different sets of general principles of thinking and living – from Potter’s list included in Bioethical Credo to Næss’ principles of deep ecology (see Potter, 1971: p. 196; Devall & Sessions, 1985: p. 70). Some authors tried to give such guidelines by propagating some deeper universal bioethical values under the “systematic approach to bioethics” (see Gert, Culver & Clouser, 2006). Although Næss, Jonas and Leopold nevertalked about bioethics, and even less about themselves as bioethicists, it is completely clear that all three thought in bioethical manner, or, as we will point out below, they all shared some bioethical worldview.

own subset of values and personal choices, keeping as many as possible perspectives down to the level of personal identities respected.

To summarize and connect all that has been said previously, such a worldview should include: 1) the *bios* in widest sense of that word (including the habitats and any (in)directly important features for life questions) as the prime subject of primarily moral, but also all other, concerns; 2) methodology which will be maximally wide and include all possible perspectives, simultaneously giving orientational guidelines, rather than strict rules in the first place; 3) a specific sensibility for managing the whole of *bios* in everyday active engagement, by truly living a specific philosophy, living a bioethical life.

To promote such worldview, one should be an extraordinary role model of such living, and not just a good “life scientist” or “professional expert”. A bioethicist should integrate all the aforementioned in a unique way through his/her living, living and leading the bioethical worldview. As a leader of such a worldview, confronted with different ethical concerns, collaborating with different professionals, bioethicists necessarily, while managing change, simultaneously forms his/her (professional and overall) identity. Moreover, he/she cannot abdicate responsibilities and demonstrate moral disengagement, and must be aware of the influence and appropriateness of voicing opinions and direct consequences of behaviours that are observed and evaluated by others (followers). In order to do this, it seems that concept of (effective) ethical leadership could be relevant source for guidance on leadership ethics for bioethicists.

### Effective Ethical Leadership

In trying to offer scientific explanations of ethical behaviour in complex working environments as well as helping organisations to understand the contribution of ethical leadership style, even in considering cultural and contextual nuances that may affect one’s expression of ethical behaviour, researchers investigate different aspects of effective ethical leadership. Understanding leadership as a process of influencing people through principles, values and behaviours, speaking generally, some studies deal with the definitions and theoretical constructs related to the concept of ethical leadership. Other research identifies antecedents of ethical leadership, the role of others’ perception of leaders’ traits, values, motivation and the types of leadership behaviour most likely to influence follower’s ethical performance and satisfaction. Through the process of investigating various outcomes and effects on follower’s engagement and work in general, in describing the process of developing and maintaining the ethical behaviour of leaders, and when providing answers about how leadership behaviour forms leadership in ethical culture, researchers offer instruments for measuring effective leadership behaviours.<sup>7</sup>

In reviewing research on effective leadership behaviour and its effects, Yukl et al. (2011) proposed a hierarchical taxonomy focusing on leadership behaviours relevant for effective leadership organising them in three meta-categories and describing their component behaviours.

“Leaders should demonstrate ethical leader behaviours in task-, relations-, and change-oriented leader behaviours.” (Yukl et al., 2011: p. 9)

The relevance of specific aspects of these behaviour metacategories depends on the situation. For task-oriented behaviour the primary objective is to

accomplish work in an efficient and reliable way (e.g., provide clear roles, challenging goals, coordination, and efficient use of resources). Specific component behaviours include planning, monitoring and organizing work activities, clarifying roles and objectives, resolving work-related problems. Leaders use relations-oriented behaviours like supporting and building cooperative relationships, and helping people cope with stressful situations, showing concern for their needs and feelings.

“Supporting also includes encouraging cooperation and mutual trust and mediating conflicts.” (Yukl, 2012: p. 71)

Providing support, developing the skills and confidence of others, showing sincere, specific and timely recognition, and empowering their followers skills by giving them more autonomy and influence over decisions are found to be positively related behaviours of effective leaders. When leaders use change-oriented behaviours they try to increase innovation, collective learning, and adaptation to external changes. Specific behaviours promoted include advocating change, articulating an inspiring vision, encouraging innovation and collective learning.

“Leaders can encourage people to look at problems from different perspectives, to think outside the box when solving problems, to experiment with new ideas, and to find ideas in other fields that can be applied to their current problem or task. By creating a climate of psychological safety and mutual trust, a leader can encourage members of the team or organization to suggest novel ideas.” (Yukl, 2012: p. 73)

When such described leadership behaviours are accompanied with “external” behaviours of a leader this can facilitate performance (like networking, providing and analysing relevant information, identifying threats and opportunities, getting necessary resources and promoting the reputation and interests of the team or work unit), they all increase different positive outcomes that are well supported with research findings.

Yukl et al. (2011) developed and assessed a questionnaire that measured the perception of followers as they identified the most relevant behaviours to ethical leadership. The research highlighted important characteristics of ethical leadership such as: integrity, honesty, fairness (in decisions and the distribution of rewards e.g. no favouritism or use of rewards to motivate improper behaviour), communication of ethical values, consistency of behaviour with espoused values, and ethical guidance. Highly ethical leaders value honest relationships with their followers showing fairness in decision-making and distributing awards, in the expression of kindness, compassion and concern for the needs and feelings of others (rather than attempts to manipulate, abuse and exploit others for personal gain). In the bioethical context this is extremely important considering the necessary dialogue of different disciplines and perspectives as a prerequisite for understanding and solving complex bioethical issues.

Brown et al. (2005: p. 120) defined ethical leadership as “the demonstration of normatively appropriate conduct through personal actions and interpersonal relationships, and the promotion of such conduct to followers through

two-way communication, reinforcement, and decision-making”. It means that to be able to influence followers’ ethical behaviour, leaders must communicate ethical standards, requiring that ethical leaders have to personally demonstrate and to role-model appropriate ethical behaviour for followers, communicating their actions to followers and encouraging ethical conduct. Thus, “ethical leadership is not only about traits such as integrity and honesty, but also about efforts to make subordinates accountable for behaving ethically” (Yukl, 2011: p. 2). Brown et al. (2005) developed a measure for ethical leadership which identifies different outcomes in relationship to organizational members and serve as a predictor of the perceived ethical behaviour of leaders. A leader’s overall score predicted outcomes such as perceived effectiveness of leaders, employees’ satisfaction with job, employees’ willingness for putting extra effort into their work, and reporting problems.

In the long term, promoting and enhancing ethical behaviour in followers or in institutions and emphasizing the intrinsically rewarding aspects of such leads to better integration of such conduct. Studies found such positive cascade effects of ethical leadership on lower level employees, because ethical leaders support an environment in which followers feel free to identify problems and opportunities, propose solutions and strategies, and share ideas for improving (see Mayer et al., 2009a). At the same time, studies found negative impacts of moral disengagement and the occurrence of unethical leader behaviour (see Loe et al., 2000; Aquino and Reed, 2002; Pagliaro et al., 2018). The role of leaders is in the process of guiding and directing the individual’s behaviour towards shared and desired purposes and goals and for the leader to develop a culture that enables positive outcomes (see Yukl, 2009). Ethical leaders inform individuals of the benefits of ethical behaviour and the cost of inappropriate behaviour, setting clear standards and holding followers accountable for their ethical conduct (see Treviño et al., 2003; Treviño and Brown, 2004).

When investigating the role of leadership in (non)ethical behaviour and the spill over effect in the work settings, studies found the mediation role of the ethical climate significant (see Mayer et al., 2009b; Mayer et al., 2012; Moore et al., 2012). Research results show that leaders have a key role in encouraging ethical behaviour and reducing misconduct and interpersonal conflicts among employees (see Mayer et al., 2010; Schaubroeck et al., 2012).

Studies results confirm important antecedents of ethical leadership like personality traits (see Walumbwa and Schaubroeck, 2009; Kalshoven et al., 2011; Hoffman et al., 2012) and virtues (see Riggio et al., 2015) of a leader. Leader’s moral identity (see Mayer et al., 2012), level of cognitive moral development (see Schminke et al., 2005; McCauley et al., 2006; Jordan et al., 2013), ethical awareness (see Resick et al., 2006) and ethical role models that leaders had for learning ethical behaviour (see Brown and Treviño, 2014) proved to be significant predictors of ethical leadership. Furthermore, studies in different organizational settings confirmed a positive impact of ethical leadership on perceived work efficiency, job satisfaction (see Piccolo et al., 2010; Tanner et al., 2010), prosocial behaviour, organizational commitment (see Mayer et al., 2009a; Philipp and Lopez, 2013; Benevene et al., 2018), work motivation and the well-being of followers/employees (see Kalshoven and Boon, 2012).

According to research results it is legitimate to conclude that ethical leadership is an important skill needed for bioethicists if they want to promote the values included in the bioethical worldview they share and if they want to act through their followers as a primary way for any visible and effective

normative change. But firstly, there is a need to demonstrate behaviour that reflects integrity, supports objectivity, and fosters trust in professional activities. We find two aspects especially relevant for such phenomenon. First is the place and role of moral identity in the context of ethical leadership – which is important in a follower’s motivational rationale. Second is the way in which followers identify attributions of a leader – which is important for conceiving mechanisms for effective leadership.

### **Moral Identity and Ethical Leadership**

A self-conception that is relevant in the context of ethical behaviour of a leader is one’s moral identity and the degree to which being moral and following moral values is important or central for defining one’s own identity. Thus, researchers were interested in exploring the links between moral identity and moral functioning (see Hardy and Carlo, 2005; Hannah et al., 2011; Sharif and Scandura, 2014; Sanders et al., 2018). Recent meta-analysis confirmed that moral identity positively predicts individuals’ readiness to engage in pro-social and ethical behaviour as well as to abstain from antisocial behaviour and it plays a moderating and mediating role as a predictor of moral action (Hertz & Krettenauer, 2016). Research investigated different measures of attitudes and values relevant to ethics and those related to individual ethical traits like belief in a just world, Machiavellianism, and moral courage, with a relatively small number of studies linking the moral identity of a leader with ethical leadership. The results focusing on the processes when people do not follow their own moral principles and when they intentionally (de)activate moral self-regulatory mechanisms are interesting because they are trying to identify variables that can explain what motivates leaders (managers) and their followers to behave (un)ethically.

The social cognitive conception of moral identity (Aquino and Reed, 2002; Aquino et al., 2009) defines moral identity as a self-schema organized around a set of moral trait associations (e.g. honesty, caring, compassionate) and points out the centrality of this identity to an individual’s self or to the cues that relate to morality in the environment that aids in predicting various forms of moral behaviour. The more central a person’s moral identity is to the sense of self, the more important it is to the person to be moral. Aquino and Reed (2002) argue that moral identity influences moral behaviour by acting as a self-regulatory mechanism rooted in people’s internalized notions of right and wrong, motivating them to act morally. Leaders who have a high score on the measures of moral identity show behaviours that are consistent with their moral identity thereby demonstrating ethical leadership (Mayer et al., 2012) and the use of fair procedures (Brebels et al., 2010). A leader with a high moral identity, an identity central to his/her sense of self, will be responsible and is more likely to resist negative pressures, showing behaviours in accordance with their own definitions rather than giving in to pressure and acting unethically because they would then feel a high level of discomfort (see Blasi, 1999).

“When ethical behaviour does not reflect on the self-concept, that is, when being a moral person is not important to the sense of self, moral drivers are less likely to translate into heightened motivation to act selflessly and into actual ethical behavior.” (Sanders et al., 2018: p. 633)

Bandura (1999) introduced the concept of moral disengagement to explain why people may act unethically. He identified belief mechanisms that people

use to justify or rationalize their own unethical behaviours. Whenever they behave unethically they disengage from their moral responsibilities invoking beliefs by which they justify or explain their behaviour. Examples of such justifications range from justifying immoral behaviour with creativity, misrepresentation, contrasting their behaviour with even more unethical examples, ensuring that their acts seem reasonable in comparison or by trivializing the consequences of their behaviour, minimizing the amount suffering created or even blaming someone else (see Hinrichs et al., 2012). Leaders who communicate a strong ethics/values message (who are moral managers), but who are not perceived to be ethical themselves (not moral persons) can be thought of as hypocritical leaders (Batson et al., 1999). Research also identified different situational or contextual factors that can trigger morally disengaged reasoning and unethical behaviours (Kish-Gephart et al., 2010; Kish-Gephart et al., 2014; Martin et al., 2014).

Treviño and Brown (2004: p. 77) summarize this link between leader’s moral identity and his/her effective ethical leadership opening the room for authenticity:

“Developing a reputation for ethical leadership requires more than strong personal character. In order to be effective ethical leaders, executives must demonstrate that they are ethical themselves, they must make their expectations of others’ ethical conduct explicit, and they must hold all of their followers accountable for ethical conduct every day.” (Treviño and Brown, 2004: p. 77)

Shortly put, in a more philosophical manner, effective ethical leaders are morally authentic leaders (persons of moral integrity), and this brings us to the second important feature of effective ethical leadership.

### **How Followers Make Attributions of Leader’s Integrity**

The sincerity and authenticity of a leader, as well as competence, are recognized by followers and have direct consequences on work performance (Greenbaum et al., 2015). Proponents of various leadership theories claim that leaders whose behaviour reflects values such as honesty, altruism, compassion, fairness, courage, and humility will be more effective (Greenleaf, 1970; Fry, 2003; Avolio et al., 2004). The impact of leaders with their responsibilities to treat followers with dignity and respect, meaning to show sensitivity to others’ needs and concerns is enormous. Northouse (2007) has listed five principles of ethical leadership. According to these principles ethical leaders respect others, serve others, are just, are honest and they build community. Followers’ perceptions of ethical leadership predict satisfaction with the leader, perceived leader effectiveness, willingness to exert extra effort on the job, and willingness to report problems (Brown and Treviño, 2006: p. 597). According to this research, ethical leadership must be recognizable in the way leaders make decisions, in their attitudes and the way he/she interacts with others. If a leader is seen to be ethical, then his/her actions have credibility. This includes congruence of conduct and proclaimed values. Ethical leaders are credible because they are trustworthy and practice what they preach (Brown and Treviño, 2006; Brown and Treviño, 2014). Inconsistency of behaviour concerning the values that the leader stands for can be perceived as hypocrisy (Treviño et al., 2003; Simons, 2002; Mayer et al., 2009b). Moreover, when a leader is evaluated ethically, but his followers

or teammates do not share his opinion, team outcomes will be low (Šendula-Pavelić et al., 2014).

Following Bandura’s social learning theory, for leaders to be perceived as ethical leaders by their followers, they must be attractive and credible role models (Bandura, 1986). Ethical leaders are likely sources of guidance and influence because of their attractiveness and credibility as role models of modelled ethical behaviour which draws attention. Ethical leadership or leaders’ ethics is furthermore strongly correlated with the motivation of followers in engaging with activities proposed by leader. Through vicarious learning, followers become more confident not only in their abilities to act in an ethical manner but also in resolving challenges that may arise in their social interaction with others (see Brown et al., 2005).

The motivational theory of role modeling propose that role models serve three distinct functions in which they influence goals and motivation:

“(a) they show us how to perform a skill and achieve a goal – they are behavioral models; (b) they show us that a goal is attainable – they are representations of the possible, and (c) they make a goal desirable – they are inspirations.” (Morgenroth et al., 2015: p. 3)

Behavioural integrity theory focuses on the perceived alignment between person’s words and actions (Simons, 2002), which underlines the importance of leaders’ being authentic and true to themselves.

Authentic leaders “are deeply aware of how they think and behave and are perceived by others as being aware of their own and others’ values, moral perspective, knowledge, and strengths; aware of the context in which they operate; and who are confident, hopeful, optimistic, resilient, and high on moral character” (Avolio et al., 2004: p. 4). Walumbwa et al. (2008) developed a questionnaire about authentic leadership with items that describe the leader’s behaviour within four scales: self-awareness, relational transparency, internalized moral perspective, and balanced processing. For ethical leadership two scales were found to be significant: 1) internalized moral perspective (where leader behaviour is guided by internal moral standards and personal values; decision making that is based on core beliefs, and that expresses beliefs that are consistent with actions), and 2) relational transparency (leader reveals values and beliefs accurately, says exactly what he/she means, admits mistakes openly). Bass and Stiedlmeier (1999) argue that authentic leaders who have long-term transformational moral influence in the organization are perceived as ethical leaders, while the moral legitimacy of the style of leadership depends on securing freedom and opportunities for others (speaking of truth, keeping promises, sharing of merit) together with rewarding and sanctions (grounded in the worldview of their own interest).

To sum up these findings, ethical leadership and morality (of a leader) is observed and perceived by followers and such perceived ethical leadership has implications on the legitimacy of leader’s decisions and actions, it is positively correlated with the followers’ and team members’ motivations and behaviours, meaning that modelling ethical behaviour is important (see Mayer et al., 2012; Greenbaum et al., 2015; Šendula-Pavelić et al., 2015). Research has shown that peer influence as well as ethical climate and ethical culture are important factors and predictors of (un)ethical behaviour (see Loe et al., 2000; Gino et al., 2009; Mayer et al., 2011; Mazar et al., 2008). “Healthy” social environments depend on the ability of individuals to model and lead through exemplifying ethical norms and values. Strong leadership through personal behaviour

is effective when followers see them in practice. If the leader is seen to be ethical, then his actions have credibility, and mutual goals can be realised.

## **The Bioethicist as a Leader?**

### **Necessities of Skills: The Obligations of the Role**

Bioethicists are in a constant dialogue with real life questions. The dilemmas faced today depend on the prevailing worldview which largely determines the way we all respond to bioethics' issues related to the many technological challenges and new needs of society. “Helping ourselves and others grow in moral perception” is a difficult and complicated task for the bioethicist as a leader (Andre, 2007: p. 227) In order to be considered as ethical leaders, bioethicists should follow some principle of conduct.<sup>8</sup> Research suggests that leadership is about relationship and that we lead best by sharing a vision that inspires others to action. That is why it is important to promote adequate fundamental values, and bioethics should have a huge role here. Prerequisites for leadership in bioethics are numerous. Dialogue in bioethics requires tolerance, receptiveness for as many as possible perspectives, attentive listening, humility, etc... Active decision making, critical observations, interdisciplinary cooperation and high social responsibility are crucial. Many acknowledged bioethicists underline these points.

For example, Callahan has spoken about the need for a broad perspective and rootedness in everyday life (Callahan, 2012<sup>9</sup>); Reich stresses the need for interdisciplinarity (Reich, 1995a<sup>10</sup>); Buchanan points out the responsibility of bioethics to speak loudly and engage in the public domain despite some obstacles (Buchanan, 2007<sup>11</sup>); King warns on special responsibility to consider possible misunderstanding on proclaimed statements (King, 2007<sup>12</sup>); and Chattopadhyay and colleagues stress the necessary proactiveness of bioethics (Chattopadhyay et al., 2012) etc.

Thus, there are some strong reasons for arguing for some common worldview<sup>13</sup> shared by bioethicists, a kind of bioethical worldview, with at least one universal common idea: respect for *bios*, respect for life (see Zagorac, 2017: pp. 133–134).<sup>14</sup> If so, such a worldview should have at least some features or attributes which could be singled out, analysed and evaluated. It should have some basic standards of promoting or phenomenologically presenting such a worldview. In other words, there should be some clear and visible standards of bioethical practice which develop, promote and enrich such a worldview based on respect for all life. One such standard brings up the awareness of the fact that bioethicists should be continually role models which, accompanied by full moral integrity, shows respect for all life. That means that her/his practice should not be paused, it is intertwined with her/his whole life and every word, behaviour and gesture should follow the basic idea in her/his worldview. Life is here, around us, every day and every moment. Our connection and interaction with all life (from other people to animals and to plants) is constant. Thus, such a worldview is necessarily rooted in the personality and integrity of bioethicists. Notwithstanding possible “specializations” in different areas (e.g. environmental issues, animal ethics, medical dilemmas, etc...), bioethicists should not have the luxury “to forget” or “to temporarily pause” all other ways of showing respect for life. This is because respect for life entails constant and deep sensibility<sup>15</sup> which is not situated in some part of bioethicist's life (e.g. workplace with professional duties and roles), but

encompasses all the empirical identities of a person and should be identified in every dimension, mode or level of our human life.<sup>16</sup>

If we speak about a shared worldview and related sensibility, we have to look at the bioethicist as a necessary role model. But what then differentiates a

8

One of “fathers of bioethics”, Van Renselaer Potter, has emphasized that leaders must have a humane, all encompassing bioethics geared to bioethical sustainability over the long term (see Potter, 1971: p. 205).

9

Callahan condemned standpoint of “ideal observer” and devoted his life and work to “real life” bioethics (see especially Callahan, 2012: pp. 14–16). This is probably one of main reasons of his great success as a bioethicist.

10

There is more Reich’s works, but his role as an editor of *Encyclopedia(s) of Bioethics* and provision of first “official” definition was probably the most influential point concerning the justification of bioethics as a paradigmatic interdisciplinary endeavour.

11

Bioethics community cannot afford to remain silent or on the other hand to prioritize and pursue some topics over others, despite the fact that “the activities in which we engage, the institutions in which and with which we work, and the experience we gain from these influences also affect our perspectives about what is important in the field, and why” (Buchanan, 2007: p. 299).

12

Cf. “People who do bioethics necessarily have to think about how what is said is heard and used by others. [...] Although bioethics has no special authority, by its very nature it seems clearly to have a special responsibility to consider and address the possibility that things may be misheard or misapplied across disciplines.” (King, 2007: p. 308)

13

For our purposes, and following Zagorac’s advice, we can stick to the most common and widespread meanings of the term ‘worldview’, namely as “an all-encompassing philosophy of life, composed of a personal or a social ideology” or “an intertwined, interrelated, interconnected system of beliefs” (Zagorac, 2017: p. 132). This system of beliefs “consists of core and peripheral beliefs – their status depends on how important they are for maintaining the integrity of the system. While peripheral beliefs can be removed or altered without endangering the entire system, the core ones are at its center, and the whole system will run smoothly as long as they remain

intact. Things change dramatically when the core belief is no longer supported.” (Zagorac, 2017: pp. 132–133)

14

For our discussion in this paper we will use the general determination of bioethical worldview provided by Zagorac: “an all-encompassing philosophy of life, composed of a personal or a social ideology” or “an intertwined, interrelated, interconnected system of beliefs” (Zagorac, 2017: p. 132). The aforementioned system of beliefs, “the concept of respect for all life – respect for *bios* – can present a ground for the establishment of a new worldview. A worldview based on respect for *bios* would need to interconnect objective knowledge of the phenomenon of life with the responsibility of moral subjects to respect it. To put it in more provocative terms, it could also be claimed that bioethics, as a pre-existing system that promotes respect for *bios*, is a new worldview. [...] I shall focus on the sustainability of the thesis that respect for *bios* can be the core puzzle piece of a new worldview. I shall also rephrase the previous statement (‘bioethics is a new worldview’) into the following one: a *certain kind* of bioethics *can be* a new worldview.” (Zagorac, 2017: p. 133) It could be added that such bioethics needs four essential components: 1) related to content – it is concerned with the life and the living; 2) related to methodology – it requires pluralism of perspectives; 3) related to activism – it includes proactive behavior; 4) related to sensibility – it has a strong sense of sharing feelings for respect, empathy and commonality (see more in Eterović, 2019: pp. 274–281; cf. also Eterović, 2023: pp. 305–314).

15

For an extensive and comprehensive elaboration of bioethical sensibility, see Zagorac, 2018. Sensibility is a very important and probably crucial feature in discussing the nature of bioethics, and even more in the context of bioethical leadership, but extensive discussion of this should be left for another occasion, due to the lack of space.

16

It is interesting that the second definition of bioethics points exactly to such different modes of normative activity: “moral vision, decisions, conduct, and policies” (Reich, 1995a: p. xxi).

bioethicist from common people who live according to a similar worldview? The answer should be found in bioethicist's active engagement and constant awareness in spreading and promoting those practices, behaviours and values grounded in the respect for life. Such reasoning brings us to the conclusion that bioethicists have some particular responsibilities for some kind of “bioethical enlightenment”. That means bioethicists have to develop some additional skills for this new kind of enlightenment and (bio)ethical leadership is an attractive candidate for providing such skills, because bioethicists have to be role models for moral integrity according to the bioethical worldview, they have to lead other people as role models demonstrating appreciated values, they have the responsibility to gain (global) public trust in sincere and consistent will and action for making the world better, for constant, real and visible improvement. Accordingly, if respect for life is a grounding value in the bioethical worldview it should be effectively transferred and shared with others as a basic common value of normative guidance. Thus, effective ethical leadership is an essential skill in the establishment of such a context and should be the first step of a bioethicist's engagement.

### **The Role and Importance of Ethical Leadership for Bioethical Leadership**

Insights from the results of psychological investigations reveal that the way bioethicists represent their selves, use their knowledge and skills, and how they communicate with others is important. Influence on the formation of peoples' moral beliefs depends on the perception of an ethical realm and on trust, but also the perception of a leader's moral identity is crucial for the motivation of followers. Moreover, the cohesion between the exposed values and behaviours of a leader are crucial, or, in ethical vocabulary, moral integrity is an essential feature of a good leader. In the bioethical context, this has enormous implications and importance for several reasons.

First, bioethics is oriented towards changing the world. Bioethicists should be, also. This is impossible without effecting some sort of personal impact on others. In other words, this is impossible without influencing others to become followers who share common values and/or a common worldview. Without effective leadership, the bioethicist is paralysed and completely cut off from the essential meaning of bioethics as an active, propulsive, every day effort in making the world better. Bioethics is bioethics only if it is lived. And it can be lived only if there are bioethical worldviews. By its nature, as normatively grounded, such a worldview has the active intention of spreading normativity. Ethical leadership is a necessary tool for breeding and promoting an evolution of common bioethical values.

Second, ethical leadership can be taken as a crucial guideline for the self perception of bioethicists. It is a unique way of splicing the theory with practice with an eye to everyday effective results, because it needs a tremendous capacity of normative reflection on the one side, but constant sensibility and prudence in practice on the other. Thus, ethical leadership is a kind of regulatory test for the bioethicist in the sense of checking how well (s)he is doing her/his job. It is a minimal justification of having the right to call her/him-self a bioethicist at all. It is a firm start in the evaluation of bioethics as a profession: people incapable of bioethical leadership could hardly be taken as real bioethicists in any convincing sense.<sup>17</sup>

Third, closely related to previous points, it has enormous pragmatic usefulness around the discussions about the determination and definition of bioethics, because it is operative enough (even measurable with psychological methodological tools), but still open enough concerning the space to manoeuvre required in building a unique moral integrity of each bioethical leader inside the broad bioethical worldview. In such way we do not have so much need for theoretical hair splitting about definitions, but we have at the same time a clear framework for the inclusion of all relevant bioethical principles, values and norms. We gain an important regulative standard for disseminating what true bioethical work consists of.

Ethical leadership, thus, becomes an important integrative element of bioethics, on several levels. It integrates the whole personality (actually, it indicates the integration of personality) and work (behaviour) of the individual bioethicist making him/her authoritative in the field of normativity. Bioethics is not just a profession, as some authors indicate (see Ozar, 2014), but is a true call, a vocation: it involves a person engaged in it fully and continually. There is no fixed work schedule for bioethicists – she is always at work. Her life is bioethics. It is a worldview, a way of living. That is because bioethics includes the promotion of values not just the talk about them.<sup>18</sup> Discussion about ethical leadership tries to demonstrate that point. Like ethics or any normative profession, in bioethics a full and true way of acting professionally involves the promotion of norms and values – it becomes a call, which is far beyond a (simple) profession. It also integrates the bioethics community providing a possibility of mutual influence on harmonization and providing for a consensus about common values. It also integrates different perspectives and disciplines in a common theoretical and practical way, building a unique actively engaged worldview and thus encompassing all modes of human life from personal emotional aspects to global political awareness.

There is a tremendous impulse for the development and refinement of bioethics in general, and especially integrative bioethics in particular. It reveals that bioethics is not just a “profession”, but a life call connected to all the spheres and dimensions of a bioethicist as an active agent in living and promoting the authentic bioethical worldview. Thus, bioethical leadership is a specific usage of ethical leadership qualities and skills for guiding the everyday living of the bioethical worldview, taken not only as a kind of theoretical stance, but as a whole, reflective, and practical engagement of the person in sharing, promoting and, with help of the others, making this world a better place.

## References

Andre, J. (2007). Learning to listen: second-order moral perception and the work of bioethics. In: L. A. Eckenwiler & F. G. Cohn (eds.), *The Ethics of Bioethics: Mapping the Moral Landscape*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, pp. 220–228.

Aquino, K. & Reed, A. I. (2002). The self-importance of moral identity scale. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 83(6), pp. 1423–1440, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1037/t08774-000>.

17

The connection between bioethical leadership and bioethical professionalisation could not be discussed here and should be left for a separate article.

18

For a detailed elaboration of this thesis on the example of bioethics of mountaineering see Eterović, 2023, especially pp. 263–324.

- Aquino, K., Freeman, D., Reed, A., Lim, V. K. G., & Felps, W. (2009). Testing a social-cognitive model of moral behavior: The interactive influence of situations and moral identity centrality. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 97(1), pp. 123–141, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0015406>.
- Avolio, B. J., Gardner, W. L., Walumbwa, F. O., Luthans, F., & Mayo, D. R. (2004). Unlocking the mask: A look at the process by which authentic leaders impact follower attitudes and behaviors. *Leadership Quarterly*, 15(6), pp. 801–823, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2004.09.003>.
- Bandura, A. (1986). *Social foundations of thought and action: A social cognitive theory*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Bandura, A. (1999). Moral disengagement in the preparation of inhumanities. *Personal and Social Psychology Review*, 3(3), pp. 193–209, doi: [https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327957pspr0303\\_3](https://doi.org/10.1207/s15327957pspr0303_3).
- Baron, J. (2006). *Against Bioethics*. Cambridge – London: MIT Press.
- Bass, B. M. & Steidlmeier, P. (1999). Ethics, character, and authentic transformational leadership behavior. *Leadership Quarterly*, 10(2), pp. 181–217, doi: [https://doi.org/10.1016/s1048-9843\(99\)00016-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/s1048-9843(99)00016-8).
- Batson, C. D., Thompson, E. R., Seuferling, G., Whitney, H., & Strongman, J. A. (1999). Moral hypocrisy: Appearing moral to oneself without being so. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 77(3), pp. 525–537, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.77.3.525>.
- Beauchamp, T. L. & Childress, J. F. (2013). *Principles of Biomedical Ethics*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Benevene, P., Dal Corso, L., De Carlo, A., Falco, A., Carluccio, F., & Vecina, M. L. (2018). Ethical Leadership as Antecedent of Job Satisfaction, Affective Organizational Commitment and Intention to Stay Among Volunteers of Non-profit Organizations. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 1(9), pp. 1–17, doi: <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.02069>.
- Blasi, A. (1999). Emotions and moral motivation. *Journal for the Theory of Social Behavior*, 29(1), pp. 1–19, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/1468-5914.00088>.
- Brebels, L., De Cremer, D., Van Dijke, M., & Van Hiel, A. (2010). Fairness as social responsibility: A moral self-regulation account of procedural justice enactment. *British Journal of Management*, 22, pp. 47–58, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-8551.2010.00715.x>.
- Brown, M. E., Treviño, L. K. & Harrison, D. A. (2005). Ethical leadership: A social learning perspective for construct development and testing. *Organisational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes*, 97(2), pp. 117–134, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2005.03.002>.
- Brown, M. E. & Treviño, L. K. (2006). Ethical leadership: A review and future directions. *Leadership Quarterly*, 17(6), pp. 595–616, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2006.10.004>.
- Brown, M. E. & Treviño L. K. (2014). Do role models matter? An investigation of role modelling as an antecedent of perceived ethical leadership. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 122(4), pp. 587–598, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-013-1769-0>.
- Buchanan, A. (2007). Social Moral Epistemology and the Role of Bioethicists. In: L. A. Eckenwiler & F. G. Cohn (eds.), *The Ethics of Bioethics: Mapping the Moral Landscape*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, pp. 288–296.
- Callahan, D. (2012). *In Search of the Good: A Life in Bioethics*. Cambridge – London: MIT Press, doi: <https://doi.org/10.7551/mitpress/9483.001.0001>.
- Chattopadhyay, S., Gillon, J. J., Jr, & De Vries, R. (2012). Where are all the bioethicists when you need them? *Journal of the Royal Society of Medicine*, 105(4), pp. 143–145, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1258/jrsm.2012.110284>.
- Côté, S., Kraus, M. W., Cheng, B. H., Oveis, C., van der Lowe, I., Lian, H., & Keltner, D. (2011). Social power facilitates the effect of prosocial orientation on empathic accuracy. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 101, pp. 217–232, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0023171>.

Čović, A., ed. (2011). *Integrative Bioethik und Pluriperspektivismus / Integrative Bioethics and Pluri-Perspectivism*. Sankt Augustin: Academia Verlag.

De Vries R. (2007). Who will guard the guardians of neuroscience? Firing the neuroethical imagination. *EMBO reports*, 8 Spec No (Suppl 1), pp. S65–S69, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1038/sj.embor.7401010>.

Devall, B. & Sessions, G, eds. (1985). *Deep Ecology: Living as if Nature Mattered*. Salt Lake City – Layton: Gibbs M. Smith, Inc. – Peregrine Smith Books.

Durso, G. R. O., Briñol, P., Petty, R. E. (2016). From Power to Inaction: Ambivalence Gives Pause to the Powerful. *Psychological Science*, 27(12), pp. 1660–1666, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0956797616669947>.

Eckenwiler, L. A. & Cohn, F. G. (2007). *The Ethics of Bioethics: Mapping the Moral Landscape*. Baltimore, MD: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Engelhardt, H. T., Jr. (2007). Bioethics as Politics: A Critical Reassessment. In: L. A. Eckenwiler & F. G. Cohn (eds.), *The Ethics of Bioethics: Mapping the Moral Landscape*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, pp. 118–133.

Engelhardt H. T., Jr. (2012). *Bioethics Critically Reconsidered: Having Second Thoughts*. Dordrecht etc.: Springer, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-94-007-2244-6>.

Eterović, I. (2017). *Kant i bioetika [Kant and Bioethics]*. Zagreb: Pergamena – Centar za integrativnu bioetiku Filozofskog fakulteta Sveučilišta u Zagrebu, pp. 266–283.

Eterović, I. (2019). Between Sport and Bioethics: Grounding the Philosophy of Mountaineering. *Synthesis philosophica*, 34(2), pp. 267–284, doi: <https://doi.org/10.21464/sp34203>.

Eterović, I. (2023). *Filozofija i bioetika planinarenja [Philosophy and Bioethics of Mountaineering]*. Zagreb: Hrvatsko filozofsko društvo.

Fry, L. W. (2003). Toward a theory of spiritual leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, 14(6), pp. 693–727, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2003.09.001>.

Galinsky, A. D., Gruenfeld, D. H., & Magee, J. C. (2003). From power to action. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 85, pp. 453–466, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1037/0022-3514.85.3.453>.

Gert, B., Culver, C. M., & Clouser, D. K. (2006). *Bioethics: A Systematic Approach*. Oxford etc.: Oxford University Press, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1093/0195159063.001.0001>.

Greenleaf, R. K. (1970). *The Servant as Leader*. Atlanta: Robert K. Greenleaf Publishing Center.

Gino, F., Ayal, S., & Ariely, D. (2009). Contagion and Differentiation in Unethical Behavior. The Effect of One Bad Apple on the Barrel. *Psychological Science*, 20(3), pp. 393–398, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1467-9280.2009.02306.x>.

Greenbaum, R. L., Mawritz, M. B., & Piccolo, R. F. (2015). When leaders fail to ‘walk the talk’: Supervisor undermining and perceptions of leader hypocrisy. *Journal of Management*, 41(3), pp. 929–956, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206312442386>.

Hannah, S. T., Avolio, B. J., & Walumbwa, F. O. (2011). Relationships between Authentic Leadership, Moral Courage, and Ethical and Pro-Social Behaviors. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 21(4), pp. 555–578, doi: <https://doi.org/10.5840/beq201121436>.

Hardy, S. A. & Carlo, G. (2005). Identity as a source of moral motivation. *Human Development*, 48, pp. 232–256, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1159/000086859>.

Hertz, S. & Krettenauer, T. (2016). Does Moral Identity Effectively Predict Moral Behavior? A Meta-Analysis. *Review of General Psychology*, 20(2), pp. 129–140, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1037/gpr0000062>.

Hinrichs, K. T., Wang, L., Hinrichs, A. T., & Romero, E. J. (2012). Moral disengagement through displacement of responsibility: The role of leadership beliefs. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 42(1), pp. 62–80, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1559-1816.2011.00869.x>.

Hoffman, B. J., Strang, S. E., Kuhnert, K. W., Campbell, W. K., Kennedy, C. L., & LoPilato, A. C. (2013). Leader Narcissism and Ethical Context: Effects on Ethical Leadership and Leader Effectiveness. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 20(1), pp. 25–37, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1548051812465891>.

Jahr, F. [1926] (2017). Science of life and teaching of ethics. In: C. Byk & H.-M. Sass (eds.), *Fritz Jahr (1895–1953): From the Origin of Bioethics to Integrative Bioethics*. Paris: MA Editions – ESKA, pp. 15–18.

Jahr, F. [1927] (2012a). Bio-Ethics: reviewing the ethical relations of humans towards animals and plants. In: A. Muzur & H.-M. Sass (eds.), *Fritz Jahr and the Foundations of Global Bioethics: The Future of Integrative Bioethics*. Zürich – Münster: Lit Verlag, pp. 1–4.

Jahr, F. [1928] (2012b). Animal protection and ethics. In: A. Muzur & H.-M. Sass (eds.), *Fritz Jahr and the Foundations of Global Bioethics: The Future of Integrative Bioethics*. Zürich – Münster: Lit Verlag, pp. 9–12.

Jahr, F. [1935] (2012c). Faith and works: opposition and alliance. In: A. Muzur & H.-M. Sass (eds.), *Fritz Jahr and the Foundations of Global Bioethics: The Future of Integrative Bioethics*. Zürich – Münster: Lit Verlag, pp. 45–48.

Jennings, B. (2014a). Introduction. In: B. Jennings (ed.), *Bioethics*. Farmington Hills etc.: Gale – Cengage Learning, pp. xv–xxii.

Jennings, B., ed. (2014b). *Bioethics*. Farmington Hills etc.: Gale – Cengage Learning.

Jonas, H. (1985). *The Imperative of Responsibility: In Search of an Ethics for the Technological Age*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Jonsen, A. R. (1993). The Birth of Bioethics. *Hastings Center Report*, suppl. 23, no. 6, pp. S1–S4.

Jonsen, A. R. (1998). *The Birth of Bioethics*. New York: Oxford University Press, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1093/oso/9780195103250.001.0001>.

Jonsen, A. R. (2014). History of Bioethics. In: B. Jennings (ed.), *Bioethics*. Farmington Hills etc.: Gale – Cengage Learning, pp. 331–336.

Jordan, J., Brown, M. E., Treviño L. K., & Finkelstein, S. (2013). Someone to look up to: Executive-follower ethical reasoning and perceptions of ethical leadership. *Journal of Management*, 39(3), pp. 660–683, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206311398136>.

Jurić, H. (2017). The Footholds of an Integrative Bioethics in the Work of Van Rensselaer Potter. *Facta Universitatis*, 15(2), pp. 127–144, doi: <https://doi.org/10.22190/fulp1702127j>.

Kalshoven, K., Den Hartog, D., & De Hoogh, A. (2011). Ethical leader behavior and big five factors of personality. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 100, pp. 349–366, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-010-0685-9>.

Kalshoven, K. & Boon, C. T. (2012). Ethical leadership, employee well-being and helping: The moderating role of human resource management. *Journal of Personnel Psychology*, 11(1), pp. 60–68, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1027/1866-5888/a000056>.

Khushf, G., ed. (2004). *Handbook of Bioethics: Taking Stock of the Field from a Philosophical Perspective*. New York etc.: Kluwer Academic Publishers, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/1-4020-2127-5>.

King, N. M. P. (2007). The Glass House: Assessing Bioethics. In: L. A. Eckenwiler & F. G. Cohn (eds.), *The Ethics of Bioethics: Mapping the Moral Landscape*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, pp. 297–309.

Kish-Gephart, J., Detert, J., & Treviño, L. K. (2014). Situational Moral Disengagement: Can the Effects of Self-Interest Be Mitigated? *Journal of Business Ethics*, 125, pp. 267–285, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-013-1909-6>.

Kish-Gephart, J. J., Harrison, D. A., & Treviño, L. K. (2010). Bad apples, bad cases, and bad barrels: Meta-analytic evidence about sources of unethical decisions at work. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(1), pp. 1–31, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0017103>.

Kopelman, L. M., ed. (2002). *Building Bioethics: Conversations with Clouser and Friends on Medical Ethics*. Dordrecht etc.: Kluwer Academic Publishers, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/0-306-46871-9>.

Leopold, A. (1949). *A Sand County Almanac*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Loe, T. W., Ferrell, L., & Mansfield, P. (2000). A review of empirical studies assessing ethical decision making in business. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 25(3), pp. 185–204, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1006083612239>.

Martin, S. R., Kish-Gephart, J. J., & Detert, J. R. (2014). Blind forces: Ethical infrastructures and moral disengagement in organizations. *Organizational Psychology Review*, 4(4), pp. 295–325, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/2041386613518576>.

Mayer, D. M., Brown, M., Priesemuth, M., & Kuenzl, M. (2009a). Antecedents and consequences of employee-supervisor agreement on ethical leadership. *Proceedings of the annual meeting of the Academy of Management*, Chicago, doi: <https://doi.org/10.5465/ambpp.2009.44257610>.

Mayer, D. M., Kuenzi, M., Greenbaum, R. L., Bardes, M., & Salvador, R. (2009b). How low does ethical leadership flow? A test of a trickle-down model. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 108, pp. 1–13, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2008.04.002>.

Mayer, D. M., Kuenzl, M., & Greenbaum, R. L. (2010). Examining the link between ethical leadership and employee misconduct: The mediating role of ethical climate. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 95(1), pp. 7–16, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-011-0794-0>.

Mayer, D. M., Aquino, K., Greenbaum, R. L., & Kuenzl, M. (2012). Who displays ethical leadership and why does it matter? An examination of antecedents and consequences ethical leadership. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55(1), pp. 151–171, doi: <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2008.0276>.

Mazar, N., Amir, O., & Arieli, D. (2008). The dishonesty of honest people: A theory of self-concept maintenance. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 45(6), pp. 633–644, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1509/jmkr.45.6.633>.

McCauley, C. D., Drath, W. H., Palus, C. J., O’Connor, P. M. G., & Baker, B. (2006). The use of constructive-developmental theory to advance the understanding of leadership. *Leadership Quarterly*, 17(6), pp. 634–653, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2006.10.006>.

Moore, C., Detert, J. R., Treviño, L. K., Baker, V. L., & Mayer, D. M. (2012). Why employees do bad things: Moral disengagement and unethical organization behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, 65(1), pp. 1–48, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.2011.01237.x>.

Moreno, J. (2007). Foreword. In: L. A. Eckenwiler & F. G. Cohn (eds.), *The Ethics of Bioethics: Mapping the Moral Landscape*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, pp. xiii–xvi.

Morgenroth, T., Ryan, M. K., & Peters, K. (2015). The Motivational Theory of Role Modeling: How Role Models Influence Role Aspirants’ Goals. *Review of General Psychology*, 19(4), pp. 465–483, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1037/gpr0000059>.

Nelson, J. L. (2007). Trusting Bioethicists. In: L. A. Eckenwiler & F. G. Cohn (eds.), *The Ethics of Bioethics: Mapping the Moral Landscape*. Baltimore: The Johns Hopkins University Press, pp. 47–55.

Northouse, G. (2007). *Leadership: Theory and Practice*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.

Ozar, D. T. (2014). Professionalism in Bioethics. In: B. Jennings (ed.), *Bioethics*. Farmington Hills etc.: Gale – Cengage Learning, pp. 349–353.

Pagliaro, S., Lo Presti, A., Barattucci, M., Giannella, V. A., & Barreto, M. (2018). On the Effects of Ethical Climate(s) on Employees’ Behavior: A Social Identity Approach. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 9, 960, pp. 1–10, doi: <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2018.00960>.

Philipp, B. L. U. & Lopez P. D. J. (2013). The Moderating Role of Ethical Leadership Investigating Relationships Among Employee Psychological Contracts, Commitment, and Citizenship Behavior. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 20(3), pp. 304–

315, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1548051813483837>.

Piccolo, R. F., Greenbaum, R., den Hartog, D. N., & Folger, R. (2010). The relationship between ethical leadership and core job characteristics. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 31(2–3), pp. 259–278, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.627>.

Post, S. G. (2004a). Introduction. In: S. G. Post (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Bioethics*. New York: MacMillan, pp. xi–xv.

Post, S. G., ed. (2004b). *Encyclopedia of Bioethics*. New York: MacMillan.

Potter, V. R. (1971). *Bioethics: Bridge to the Future*. Englewood Cliffs: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Reich, W. T. (1978a). Introduction. In: W. T. Reich (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Bioethics*. New York: Macmillan, pp. xv–xxiii.

Reich, W. T., ed. (1978b). *Encyclopedia of Bioethics*. New York: Macmillan.

Reich, W. T. (1995a). Introduction. In: W. T. Reich (ed.), *Encyclopedia of Bioethics*. New York: Simon & Schuster – Macmillan, pp. xix–xxxii.

Reich, W. T., ed. (1995b). *Encyclopedia of Bioethics*. New York: Simon & Schuster – Macmillan.

Resick, C. J., Hanges, P. J., Dickson, M. W., & Mitchelson, J. K. (2006). A cross-cultural examination of the endorsement of ethical leadership. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 63(4), pp. 345–359, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-005-3242-1>.

Riggio, R. E., Zhu, W., Reina, C., & Maroosis, J. A. (2010). Virtue-based measurement of ethical leadership: The Leadership Virtues Questionnaire. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 62(4), pp. 235–250, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0022286>.

Sanders, S., Wisse, B., Van Yperen, N. W., & Rus, D. (2018). On Ethically Solvent Leaders: The Roles of Pride and Moral Identity in Predicting Leader Ethical Behavior. *Journal of Business Ethics: JBE*, 150(3), 631–645, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-016-3180-0>.

Schaubroeck, J. M., Hannah, S. T., Avolio, B. J., Kozlowski, S. W. J., Lord, R. G., Treviño, L. K., Dimotakis, N., & Peng, A. C. (2012). Embedding Ethical Leadership within and across Organization Levels. *Academy of Management Journal*, 55(5), 1053–1078, doi: <https://doi.org/10.5465/amj.2011.0064>.

Schminke, M., Ambrose, M. L., & Neubaum, D. O. (2005). The effect of leader moral development on ethical climate and employee attitudes. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 97(2), 135–151, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.obhdp.2005.03.006>.

Sharif, M. M. & Scandura, T. A. (2014). Moral identity: Linking ethical leadership to follower decision making. In: L. Neider & C. Schriesheim (eds.), *Advances in Authentic and Ethical Leadership: Research in Management*. Charlotte: Information Age Publishing.

Simons, T. L. (2002). Behavioral integrity: The perceived alignment between managers' words and deeds as a research focus. *Organization Science*, 13(1), pp. 18–35, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1287/orsc.13.1.18.543>.

Singer, P. (2011). *Practical Ethics*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1017/cbo9780511975950>.

Sire, J. W. (2004). *Naming the Elephant: Worldview as a Concept*. Downers Grove: InterVarsity Press.

Šendula-Pavelić, M., Sušan, Z., & Jakopec, A. (2014). Effects of Ethical Leadership on motivation and behavior of team members. *22nd Annual Conference of Croatian Psychologists with International Participation*, Rovinj, Croatia.

Šendula-Pavelić, M., Sušan, Z., Jakopec, A. (2015). Group-level outcomes of ethical leadership in health care teams. *International Conference for Young Scholars: Ethics and Professionalism in Health Care. Backgrounds, Frameworks, Challenges*, Bochum, Germany.

Šendula-Pavelić, M., Sušan, Z., Jakopec, A. (2016). Attitudinal, Motivational and Behavioural Correlates of Ethical Leadership in Health-Care Teams. In: S. Salloch, V.

Sandow, J. Schildmann, & J. Vollmann (eds.), *Ethics and Professionalism in Healthcare: Transition and Challenges*. New York: Routledge, pp. 126–137, doi: <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781315580340-10>.

Tanner, C., Brugger, A., van Schie, S., & Leberherz, C. (2010). Actions speak louder than words: The benefits of ethical behaviour of leaders. *Journal of Psychology*, 218(4), pp. 225–233, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1027/0044-3409/a000032>.

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), pp. 5–37, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726703056001448>.

Treviño, L. K. & Brown, M. E. (2004). Managing to be ethical: Debunking five business ethics myths. *Academy of Management Executive*, 18(2), pp. 69–204, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1109/emr.2004.25135>.

van Harreveld, F., van der Pligt, J., & de Liver Y. N. (2009). The agony of ambivalence and ways to resolve it: Introducing the MAID model. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 13, pp. 45–61, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1088868308324518>.

Veatch, R. M. (2012). *The Basics of Bioethics*. New York: Routledge.

Walumbwa, F. O., Avolio, B. J., Gardner, W. L., Wernsing, T. S., & Peterson, S. (2008). Authentic leadership: Development and validation of a theory-based measure. *Journal of Management*, 34(1), pp. 89–126, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206307308913>.

Walumbwa, F. O. & Schaubroeck, J. (2009). Leader personality traits and employee voice behavior: Mediating roles of ethical leadership and work group psychological safety. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(5), pp. 1275–1286, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0015848>.

Wilson, D. (2012). Who Guards the Guardians? Ian Kennedy, Bioethics and the ‘Ideology of Accountability’ in British Medicine. *Social History of Medicine*, 25(1), pp. 193–211, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1093/shm/hkr090>.

Yukl, G. (2009). Leadership and organizational learning: An evaluative essay. *Leadership Quarterly*, 20(1), pp. 49–53.

Yukl, G., Mahsud, R., Hassan, S., & Prussia, G. E. (2011). An improved measure of ethical leadership. *Journal of Leadership & Organisational Studies*, 20(10), pp. 1–11, doi: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1548051811429352>.

Yukl, G. (2012). Effective Leadership Behavior: What We Know and What Questions Need More Attention. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 26(4), pp. 66–85, doi: <https://doi.org/10.5465/amp.2012.0088>.

Yukl, G. (2013). *Leadership in Organizations*. Boston etc.: Pearson Education, Inc.

Zagorac, I. (2017). Bioethical Worldview. In: C. Byk & H.-M. Sass (eds.), *Fritz Jahr (1895–1953): From the Origin of Bioethics to Integrative Bioethics*. Paris: MA Editions – ESKA, pp. 131–143.

Zagorac, I. (2018). *Bioetički senzibilitet [Bioethical Sensibility]*. Zagreb: Pergamena – Znanstveni centar izvrsnosti za integrativnu bioetiku.

**Martina Šendula Pavelić, Igor Eterović**

**Kad bioetičari »prijeđu s riječi na djela«!**

**Integrativna uloga i važnost etičkog vodstva u bioetici**

#### **Sažetak**

*Vjerojatno ne postoji disciplina koja zahtijeva element aktivizma i potrebu davanja uzora u normativnim pitanjima kao što je bioetika. Sama priroda ove propulzivne discipline upućuje u*

tom smjeru teorijski, promicanjem interdisciplinarnosti i praktički, bavljenjem važnim etičkim pitanjima i težnjom za integracijom svih danih perspektiva, uključujući i one efektivno prisutne u svakodnevnom životu. Integrativna bioetika još je aktualnija u pogledu potrebne integracije spomenutih perspektiva. Etičko vodstvo je koncept bogat sadržajem i orijentiran na norme koji bi mogao igrati temeljnu ulogu u pronalaženju ključa za istinsku integraciju teorije i prakse bioetike. Gotovo da nema ozbiljnih rasprava i istraživanja mogućnosti korištenja dobro razrađenih psiholoških istraživanja o vodstvu u takve svrhe. Ovaj bi članak trebao popuniti tu prazninu, pružajući uvjerljive dokaze za prepoznavanje i rasvjetljavanje važnosti etičkog vodstva u bioetičkim nastojanjima. Štoviše, tvrdi se da se bez etičkog vodstva pojavljuje sumnja u to jesu li bioetičari izgubili bit svog profesionalnog identiteta. Upućujući na rezultate istraživanja različitih aspekata etičkog vodstva, gradimo okvir za analogno vodstvo u području bioetike. Proširujući teorijski okvir filozofskom i psihološkom analizom, specificiramo neke potrebne značajke za takvu posebnu vrstu normativnog vodstva. Na kraju, tvrdimo da daljnje širenje pruža plodno teorijsko i praktično tlo za artikulaciju osnovnih značajki bioetičkog vodstva kao najvažnijih standarda rada i ponašanja bioetičara.

#### **Ključne riječi**

bioetika, etičko vodstvo, integrativna bioetika, psihologija

**Martina Šendula Pavelić, Igor Eterović**

### **Wenn die Bioethiker „ihren Worten Taten folgen lassen“!**

#### **Zur integrativen Rolle und Bedeutung ethischer Führung in der Bioethik**

##### **Zusammenfassung**

*Es gibt wahrscheinlich keine andere Disziplin, die so viel Aktivismus und die Notwendigkeit einer Vorbildfunktion in normativen Fragen so erfordert wie die Bioethik. Schon die Natur dieser Disziplin – in theoretischer Hinsicht durch die Förderung der Interdisziplinarität und in praktischer Hinsicht durch die Auseinandersetzung mit wichtigen ethischen Fragen und dem Bestreben, alle gegebenen Perspektiven zu integrieren, einschließlich die im täglichen Leben tatsächlich vorhanden sind – weist in diese Richtung. Die Integrative Bioethik ist noch nachdrücklicher, was die erforderliche Integration der genannten Perspektiven betrifft. Ethische Führung ist ein inhaltsreiches und normenorientiertes Konzept, das eine grundlegende Rolle bei der Suche nach einem Schlüssel für eine echte Integration von Theorie und Praxis der Bioethik spielen könnte. Es gibt kaum ernsthafte Diskussionen und Untersuchungen über die Möglichkeit, die gut ausgearbeitete psychologische Forschung zum Thema Führung für solche Zwecke zu nutzen. Dieser Beitrag soll diese Lücke schließen und schlüssige Beweise liefern, um die Bedeutung ethischer Führung in bioethischen Unternehmungen zu identifizieren und zu beleuchten. Darüber hinaus wird argumentiert, dass ohne ethische Führung der Verdacht besteht, dass Bioethiker den Kern ihrer beruflichen Identität verlieren. Anhand von Forschungsergebnissen zu verschiedenen Aspekten ethischer Führung schaffen wir einen Rahmen für die analoge Führung im Bereich der Bioethik. Indem wir den theoretischen Rahmen um philosophische und psychologische Analysen erweitern, spezifizieren wir einige notwendige Merkmale für eine solche besondere Art normativer Führung. Abschließend argumentieren wir, dass die weitere Verbreitung eine fruchtbare theoretische und praktische Grundlage für die Formulierung grundlegender Merkmale bioethischer Führung als wichtigste Standards für die Arbeit und das Verhalten von Bioethikern bietet.*

##### **Schlüsselwörter**

Bioethik, ethische Führung, Integrative Bioethik, Psychologie

**Martina Šendula Pavelić, Igor Eterović**

## **Quand les bioéthiciens « passent de la parole aux actes » !**

### **Le rôle intégratif et l'importance du leadership éthique en bioéthique**

#### **Résumé**

*Il n'existe probablement pas de discipline qui nécessite autant d'éléments d'activisme et de modèle dans les questions normatives que la bioéthique. La nature même de cette discipline propulsive nous oriente théoriquement et pratiquement dans cette direction, en promouvant l'interdisciplinarité et en abordant des questions éthiques importantes, tout en cherchant à intégrer toutes les perspectives données, y compris celles effectivement présentes dans la vie quotidienne. La bioéthique intégrative est encore plus pertinente en ce qui concerne l'intégration nécessaire de ces perspectives. Le concept de leadership éthique est riche en contenu et orienté vers les normes, et pourrait jouer un rôle fondamental pour trouver la clé d'une véritable intégration entre la théorie et la pratique de la bioéthique. Il n'y a presque pas de discussions ou de recherches sérieuses sur l'utilisation de recherches psychologiques bien élaborées sur le leadership à ces fins. Cet article vise à combler ce vide en fournissant des preuves convaincantes pour reconnaître et éclairer l'importance du leadership éthique dans les efforts bioéthiques. De plus, il est soutenu que sans leadership éthique, il existe un doute quant à savoir si les bioéthiciens ont perdu l'essence de leur identité professionnelle. En se basant sur les résultats des recherches qui traitent des divers aspects du leadership éthique, nous construisons un cadre pour un leadership analogue en bioéthique. En élargissant ce cadre théorique par une analyse philosophique et psychologique, nous spécifions certaines caractéristiques nécessaires pour un tel leadership normatif particulier. Enfin, nous affirmons que l'élargissement de cette approche offre un terreau théorique et pratique fertile pour articuler les principales caractéristiques du leadership bioéthique comme standards essentiels du travail et du comportement des bioéthiciens.*

#### **Mots-clés**

bioéthique, leadership éthique, bioéthique intégrative, psychologie