2

EVOLUTION OF LEADERSHIP: RETHINKING FROM ETHICS THE TRANSITION FROM CHARISMA TO GENERATIVITY IN THE TIME OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

Miguel Carbonell-Valin; Agustín Domingo-Moratalla &
Gloria Caballero

Abstract: This article helps to rethink traditional leadership theories in order to complement their propositions as the institutional order and people's capabilities have been challenged by Artificial Intelligence. Nowadays organizational balance and personal decision-making do not depend anymore on the influence of the leader. As data is embedded in all human structures, a new technocultural society offers the opportunity to reflect through ethics how to integrate within human centrality in its core, the challenge of the digital era. Old narratives and traditional leadership are confronted by a new ruler: the digital context. As digitalization advances, we propose the importance of the relationships between persons to understand how generative ethics is not a creative content, but

the true nature of leadership as it does care for the ones that are about to come.

Keywords: Leadership, ethics, technology, Artificial Intelligence, capacities, evolution, generativity

1. INTRODUCTION

Traditional leaders such as the former US Secretary of State Henry Kissinger rethink about leadership styles and analyze the people who exercise them (Kissinger, 2022). At the same time, he highlights the unlimited authoritarianism raising together with Artificial Intelligence (AI) systems that generate new capabilities. His analysis concludes that there is a social imbalance that needs reinvigorated ethical leadership (Kissinger et al., 2023).

This happens because there is no clear integration between ethics, technology and leadership. Are ethics structurally incorporated into creative technological development? Are ethics a transversal part of leadership or have ethics been incorporated merely when imbalances have appeared in organizations? Today there is a leadership problem as a resuly of the speed of events and over-information, which causes an excess of data or disinformation. The result is that the leader is no longer a problem solver. The leader is delegitimized as charismatic characteristics, traditional heritage customs and habits, and traditional legal, rational and ethical foundations are challenged by the data.

AI makes decisions instead of people, influencing their behaviors as well as their organizational models. This leads to a virtual reality that questions the leader and his role. Examples of this are observed at all levels: at the macro level, the case of Cambridge Analytica influencing elections in Europe or the US in 2016 through Facebook as a clear example of the authoritarianism and influence of data at a social level. It was also reflected, at a meso level, in the world of art or education when ChatGPT appeared in November 2022. The new creative capabilities of technology are influencing traditional organizational models (Msiska & Nielsen, 2018). Finally, at the micro or individual level, the emergence of digital candidates in general elections in Russia such as Alisa AI, in municipal elections in Japan with candidate Tama AI Major - both candidates in 2018 -, or more recently in Denmark with Leader Lars in 2022,

show that there is a technology-driven imbalance at the social, institutional and personal levels. Thus, human groups until now had needed balance to deal with uncertainty and had made use of tools and leaders to conveniently manage change (Carbonell-Valin & Domingo, 2022), find themselves unprotected. The problem of current leadership stems from a technological revolution where AI shapes society (Gardner, 2011).

Therefore, in order to integrate ethics, technology and leadership, we use philosophy that proposes to us reflection in order to face the challenge of the imbalance of an AI that limits our capacity for judgment and our freedom of action (Pizarro Contreras, 2023; Sadin, 2020). AI makes decisions and generates content that challenges people's capacity for judgment. There is a concern about being 'cancelled' by AI. The technocratic algorithm that eliminates decision-making capacity (Froissart, 2019; Sætra, 2020) needs to be rethought from an ethical point of view.

We are currently facing a leader who seeks to play a role in a world where AI and robotics have replaced humans in certain functions (De-Canio, 2016). Technology changes society and the dimensions that give it balance: at the macro level it changes the dynamics of power and control; at the meso or organizational level it changes processes and relationships; and at the micro level it changes behaviors and well-being. In this article we ask ourselves how the current technological context affects leadership.

One of the changes proposed by the new AI capabilities by algorithmizing decisions, adds complexity to leaders' decision making. This is why a change is proposed by integrating the leader's capabilities in the new digital context under the following premises:

1) The creative power of AI challenges the role of the leader and follower in the organization. This makes people to enhance abstract thinking because it is one of their constitutive capabilities. Today the leader has the opportunity to integrate human capabilities and those of machine agents.

2) Faced with the preponderance of data, permanent connection and dependence on technologies that create various addictions and mental problems, the person has the ability to disconnect.

3) In the face of machine learning, the person is able to develop continuous learning thanks to the ability to relate to others.

4) The ability to find a balance between mechanization of processes and abstract thinking to make decisions is entirely human. There is

a component of limiting failure that stigmatizes error. While there are no perfect traditional social models due to human vulnerability (D'Arienzo et al., 2019; West 2022), there is no perfect artificial system either. Language and chatbox models are flawed in reasoning, in correlating facts, in their design (code), or in having biases of all kinds (Borji, 2023).

Under these premises, today's leaders are overwhelmed by the amount of data and regulations that limit their ability to act. Thus, for example, at the macro level, the impact of technology on democracy, decision-making is a question of authority and how power is transferred (Gonzalez, 2021). Authoritarian systems cannot ensure control of information, thus creating an elite that isolates itself from its society. Gonzalez (2021) foresees a dysfunctionality in Western democratic societies due to their inability to process relevant information. In other words, as Harari (2018) notes, information technologies will change society.

In this context of new capabilities and growing authoritarianism, that generates imbalances, the use and control of data is a problem when the morals of different societies understand the common good in different ways. This has led to the imposition of a utilitarian logic that dominates the narrative of technological development and data management, so that the perspective of the most influential geopolitical regions ends up prevailing. Reciprocity is presented as a middle ground to present the common good between selfishness and altruism (Zamagni & Bruni, 2013; Zamagni, 2014).

The utilitarian logic that guides the proposals of control, interventionism and regulation in the field of AI encourages narratives that do not take into account the other -i.e. the persons-, but only use them. Relationships are therefore essential to find commonalities between morals that guide capable people towards the common good.

Is leadership that enables balance possible in this context? In order to answer this question, it is critical to know how leadership has been understood to date and what are the foundations that validate leadership proposals in the digital era. Undoubtedly, the current challenges have part of their answers in the classic theories of leadership, which, as presented by Kissinger (2022), allow the person to be a central figure in a highly technological context, but which requires human capabilities to find the balance at all the levels described: personal, institutional and social. In order to assimilate these changes it is necessary to reflect on leadership.

To this end, the contributions of this work are twofold. The first one is to carry out a comparative study of leadership theories to date. Secondly, to propose a general leadership framework that complements existing models and delves into the two aspects that digitalization has uncovered: dehumanization - due to algorithmization, with the consequent crisis of relationships - and personal and institutional disorganization - with a disproportionate exposure of polarizing leaders.

2. LEADERSHIP THEORIES. A COMPARATIVE REVIEW. HUMAN RELATIONS AND NARRATIVES

Leadership theories agree that this social dimension is a process of influence (Oc & Bashshur, 2013). A comparison is presented that considers two axes: the first one is communicative, where the individualist and collectivist narrative marks a differentiation between theories. The second axis is the context that has a series of internal and external elements that condition the organization (Porter & McLaughlin, 2006) and its leader (Oc, 2018), such as culture, institutional model, objectives, processes, or temporal moment in which decisions are made.

The first axis represents the narratives, that are influenced by the utilitarianism of the capitalist economic system and different organizational models with a greater or lesser level of interventionism. On the one hand, efficiency in the achievement of objectives marks a common denominator in the theories, as well as in the individual characteristics of the leader. The result of these characteristics makes it possible to find links in those theories that focus on the importance of the individual. Thus, it can be affirmed that leadership is transmitted from the individual to the organization from these models. On the other hand, other theories where the importance is systems, come from a more collectivist narrative that focuses its concern on relationships and the pragmatism necessary for problem solving to be instrumentalized. With this it can be said that it is a leadership focused from the organization to the agents.

The second axis, that of context, represents indicators from a historical, organizational and technological perspective, such as the characteristics that shape change in micro, meso and macro social structures.

Traditional leadership theories are developed in acontext of the organization of industrialization and post-industrialization. The members of these human groups are the *homo oeconomicus* who aim at profit as a

goal for the attainment of individual happiness and collective well-being. The literature review under this axis is prolix since it has been a particularly interesting dimension in recent times (Day et al., 2014; Gamarra & Girotto, 2022).

A systematic review of different leadership theories would require too much scrutiny if its goal were to understand whether there is consensus or debate on a topic and whether the problem requires particular study (Aromataris & Pearson, 2014). The intent of this proposal is not to categorize leadership theories. Our review aims to understand the tensions and the context in which these proposals were born, using the narrative that separates individual and collective in traditional philosophy, classical economics and psychosociology.

The communicative axis of the review of traditional leadership theories includes three theories of individual leadership whose methods offer interesting results for understanding the leader's motivations: transformational (Bass, 1990), exemplary (Kouzes & Posner), and the method of agency or self-determination (Ryan & Deci, 2000). The latter is useful for psychosociology reflection about how agency generates dysfunction in today's leadership. In addition, the emergence of the agent machine also challenges modelling. From the collectivist perspective: complexity theory (Uhl-Bien et al., 2007) and two theoretical models show the sensitivity provoked by certain problems for which social change is proposed. In one of these models, the relational one (Ulh-Bien, 2006), a change of the system is proposed by its leadership proposal; in the other, the instrumental (Antonakis & House, 2014), changes are proposed from the context by monitoring the leader's actions. For this measurement, the instrumental theory uses the quantitative basis of the transformational theory.

The second comparative axis is the context in which the theories are developed. This analysis includes three dimensions - historical, organizational and technological - in which leadership theories have proposed changes, without the reality of the current hybrid world influencing their conception and methodological development. "Systematic reviews collate all evidence pertinent to a priori selected criteria for eligibility to address the specific research question" (Harris et al. 2014, p.2762). The only evidence from which we start is that corporate utilitarianism and profit as an organizational objective have generated an ethical discussion about the organizational model whose motivation generates individualistic and collectivist narratives. The key question for the traditional influential leader is: what changes are proposed?

The problem of processes and the mechanization of relationships in an industrializing context such as the traditional one, makes people appear as members of a gear. This social model has been disorganized, among other reasons, because nowadays in the cloud, the carnal disappears and both the relationship and the individual are fictitious and distant. The leader has a great challenge in the face of the mechanization required to generate trust in any context, including the digital one (Carbonell-Valin & Domingo, 2022).

Measuring the relationship-oriented transition from individualistic or situational considerations to collective impacts is something to be considered (Avolio & Bass, 1995). It is from multilevel theories that this is most easily appreciated. In this review we present four multilevel models, one theoretical and one mixed. The development of the communicative or narrative axis and the context in which the leadership theories are developed is represented in Chart 1.

The result of this comparison leads us to rethink about the social narrative that has justified the traditional leadership models presented and how it influences the ethics applied in organizations.

Although the background of individualistic and collectivistic leadership theories alleges the Hegelian vision of power relations between leader and led from a psychosocial perspective (Buck-Morss, 2009), the narrative we propose focuses on human relations from the ethics of communitarian personalism (Casarotti, 2012; Domingo-Moratalla et al., 2023; Iula, 2019; Piaget 1964). This narrative allows proposing a reflective equilibrium (Rawls, 2009) before the different morals that compose the different ways of life, where individualist and collectivist models are applied. In an era of high polarization, the importance of a narrative thinking about the other, through dialogue, becomes particularly relevant. A reflective and ethical equilibrium between opposing positions is easier to achieve than sharing or integrating ways of life or 'morals'. The leader's good judgment is transmitted in its communicative and narrative capacity.

The historical context in which the aforementioned leadership theories have their roots is a post-war period. The universal principles and a social reconstruction that makes use of two antagonistic economic models with the tensions of power resulting from an 'industrial' narrative are born in this period. The leadership narrative of communitarian personalism has its foundations in post-war postulates in which the great fear was a dehumanizing leader (Arendt, 2013). This 'new' narrative is concerned with the relationship 'between' people.

Chart 1. Context and narratives of traditional leadership theories.

| | | Narrative | |
| | | Individual | |
Context	Theory	Transformational	Self-determination
Historical		Born in the 70's XX century. From commercial transactions to personal transformations	Born in the 70's XX century in decolonization processes. Promotes individual autonomy
Organizational		State control vs. free market	Identifying, initiating and sustaining a change process. Identity formation
Tecnological		Industrial automation, process improvement	Agent autonomy
Proposed change		Performance and results	Traits, process and behavior. Intrinsic (psychological) and extrinsic (autonomy) motivators.

The philosophical foundation of communitarian personalism is based on Ricoeur's (2007) reciprocal recognition by presenting a unit of measurement because the agents value each other in a similar way. From an ethical point of view, it is necessary to be careful with asymmetrical

CARBONELL-VALIN ET AL.
EVOLUTION OF LEADERSHIP: RETHINKING FROM ETHICS THE TRANSITION
FROM CHARISMA TO GENERATIVITY IN THE TIME OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

41

Narrative			
Collective			
Exemplary	Complexity	Relational	Instrumental
Born in the 80's XX century. Flourishing at the 2000's. From a charismatic to a virtuous leader	Born in the 90's XX century. Leadership is a complex interaction	Born in the 90's XX century after the fall of the USSR: minorities question authority models	Born in the 2000's XXI century. Leadership is an instrument. Bureaucracy grows globally. Increased control of the economy and power structures.
The leader builds credibility based on specific measurable behaviors. Inspires by example	As for hierarchical imbalance, the leader fosters informal interactive networks between people and ideas, in complex and dynamic systems.	Influences through an evolved social order by coordinating new perspectives, values, behaviors or ideologies.	Networks, relationships and systems enable leaders to organize. The relationship is an instrument
With the dot-com and digitalization, the human is empowered. Technology as a communication tool	Smartphones as a source of autonomy, connectivity and communication	The collective process of relationships between individuals takes place in social media. Since 2015, technology companies impose their monopoly	Digitalization to exercise power. Users instead of people. Promotion of collaborative relationships and integration of technologies.
Aims to be inspirational by creating a vision for the future	As for hierarchical imbalance: shift to more direct relationships. Access to information changes agents	To solve collective problems, the leader proposes to modify the social context through partnerships and networks.	Using the transformational quantification method, it is proposed to change the leader from the context.

relationships, mainly in times of growing inequalities. Context and timing influence outcomes (Antonakis et al., 2012). In reciprocal relationships, the relationship is conditioned and there is an exchange, whereby measures are recognized (Ricoeur, 2007). This point of ex-

change presents a bridge of understanding between narratives. The crisis of dysfunctionality in organizational relationships and the impact of technology -which has modified behaviors and diminishes proximity- (Carbonell-Valin & Domingo, 2022), makes the human relationship to be lost. These realities make us rethink the narrative present in leadership theories.

The second axis from which to rethink leadership is based on the current context, since it mechanizes and dehumanizes at such a speed that we need to pause this progress because we do not know if it can put an end to the social model as we know it. The current social imbalance makes it necessary to rethink leadership.

3. INFLUENCE OF INDUSTRY 4.0. ON LEADERSHIP THEORIES

MICRO LEVEL

Traditional theories of individual leadership focus their discourse on the importance of the relationship between the leader and the follower, the leader and the members. There are narratives that state that there is a reciprocal exchange (Sparrowe & Liden, 1997). There is also a generalized tendency to understand that the leadership relationship depends on roles and organizational hierarchy (de Klerk & Kroon, 2008).

Certainly, leadership theories have been developed in an industrial and post-industrial era where transformations depended on the human agent. The latter enabled, through tools, the possibility of change. It could be said that changes occurred at the micro level: the person is transformed (Goswami et al., 2018). Today, AI and machine learning propose transformations using the human agent for implementation (Vantrepotte et al., 2022).

This reality leads to question whether the technological transformational revolution (Floridi, 2014), which proposes changes in the interaction between human and machine agents, is of such a caliber that it would be necessary to reflect on whether traditional leadership theories respond to challenges such as: virtual relationships, the autonomy of machine agents or consciousness in leading (Carbonell-Valin & Domingo, 2022). For all these reasons, leadership, as a social construct, is questioned on a revolutionary era that requires a new way of thinking (Wellman, 2017), and one that integrates narratives. There are voices clamoring for a return

to human centrism (Ivanov, 2022: Melé, 2009) in an era of high digitalization.

Data, as exponents of digitization, endanger authorship and authenticity as characteristics of people. For instance, the use of social media induces the individual not to question, and so they become a new form of mechanical control. Cortina (2022) explains that self-censorship is imposed in order to belong to a group. The context of a controllable reality, thanks to processes that come from an industrial and post-industrial techno-economic rationality, means that the legitimacy and security they offered are no longer such as for AI. We propose to discuss how this techno-cultural evolution impacts people and leadership.

In traditional leadership, the changes proposed by the theories of the individual meant an improvement in the functioning of the human teams that controlled the automation processes and it was possible to motivate them, as there were common values and a hopeful future. Today, technological advances make it possible to monitor processes that learn automatically and propose a mechanization of both the machine agent and the individual. The dynamics of rankings in a continuous measurement model affect our behavior to such an extent that they generate organizational and leadership imbalances. The examples shared in the introduction and the post-pandemic social models (SARS-CoV-2 / COVID-19) do not seem to let the person be a person. Because of this transformation, one of the objectives of this reflection is to rethink about the person, the individual: what he does and what he is.

MESO LEVEL

Today more than ever communities of persons are individuals connected through social media (Chua et al., 2011). These networks vary from traditional structures (family, companies, states…) to virtual networks that influence relationships, structures and individual behaviors differently (Carbonell-Valin & Domingo, 2022). The virtual relationship can impact the individual to the point of being unable to take responsibility (Han, 2017). The lack of responsibility or offloading decision making onto machine agents affects the individual's role (leader or follower), as well as their autonomy and ability to act. The virtual world changes the reality of psychosocial relationships to points that are difficult to determine at a time of change such as the one we are in.

Influence is a fundamental dimension or characteristic in leadership theories. There are trends that are relevant when coming from groups since they generate cohesion of perspective, makes individuals identify themselves and generates, through the Internet, a sense of credibility and belonging. Are traditional leadership theories prepared for the challenge of this new reality?

Traditionally, theoretical models of collectivist theories sought either to change the context or to change the leader from the context. The collectivist narrative has a relational foundation to bring a structural change and move from hierarchical relationships to flat relationships in which leaders are placed alongside other members of the group. This collectivism uses the meso-scale offered by organizations to promote leadership that not only affects individuals, but also influences their organizations. Self-interest or organizational interests made collectivist models make sense. Pragmatism rules in these proposals promoting direct relationships between members of different organizations (Ulh-Bien & Arena, 2017).

Leadership theories show an individual developing social competencies, or individuals shaping networks, groups or co-creating those networks (Cullen-Lester et al., 2017). It is not just about the development of individual capabilities, but understanding, "patterns of social relationships linking members of dyads and larger collectives." This need for belonging and connection is seen in pragmatic behaviors in the pursuit of particular and group interests. Today, communications in social media of individuals and groups suffer a growing polarization, just as the immediacy of connection causes relationships to lose credibility and reflection.

MACRO LEVEL

The starting point of behaviors, whether individual or collective, is affected by a technological inevitability that imposes models from data (Zuboff, 2019). The control by large technological companies (Webb, 2019), and technological inevitability have raised alarm bells in the face of a technological development for which ethical conditionings are necessary. The pursuit of happiness from clickbait is questionable. It is fundamental for societies to meet the needs of well-being, but it seems that inequalities are everywhere to be found in government systems that claim to seek the common good.

As a result, an unbridled development is observed that does not take ethical aspects into account, resulting in an excessive consumption of resources. This is the example of the development of train infrastructure in the USA and how it ended with the bison population and displaced the natives, or how electricity consumption by data centers may account for 20% in 2025 of total consumption in the world (Jones, 2018)). These are examples of social imbalances.

Industry 4.0 where AI makes decisions and changes behaviors "*eroding personal identity*" (Floridi, 2014, p. 58) has unbalanced social structures at all levels. This erosion by increased mechanization creates imbalance at micro levels such as loneliness in the young and the old (Mannion, 2018), or appearing in ruthless leadership traits (Clarke 2022). Imbalance also shows up at the organizational or meso level, when efficiency is not focused on avoiding harm (Green, 2018). An excessive surveillance society (Zuboff, 2019) affects human autonomy and dignity, however AI may be useful when used appropriately (Coeckelberg, 2020, p.198).

The patterns of behavior, collective or individual, represented a purely human reality and relationship. We have moved from an anthropomorphic reality where order was recognizable, to a digital reality that transforms relationships, behaviors and institutions. Order was a highly valued social dimension.

The macro scale that shaped society, culture and any dimension that affects a community, is overwhelmed by an ethical debate about monopoly and the exercise of power after the digital transformation that calls for a reflection on our social model. This is an ethical debate that affects the exercise of leadership regardless of the social, organizational or personal model under which the leader proposes changes and influences others.

Tradition, charisma and law have shaped the legitimacy of people and organizations (Weber, 2009), over the course of many eras. Today charisma in the hybrid world is represented by disordered -manipulative- leaders (Clarke, 2017; Leturc & Bonnet, 2022) or distanced from reality; law is temporarily a 'commodity' that increases regulation and limits people's freedoms. Traditional power structures fail to accompany social changes of all kinds in time and form. This is why it is necessary to foster personal capabilities through abstract thinking and by promoting continuous learning through relationships. In addition, a leader who knows how to find balance among this 'infinite' set of data, considering the vulnerability of people and AI systems, will also learn to disconnect in

order to influence the human groups with which the leader interacts, thanks to the capacity for reflection.

Traditional theories are based on a certain order and social structures that are currently in crisis, with outdated, bureaucratized, hyper-regulated institutions that are far removed from people's reality, in addition to serving short-term interests. Leaders tend towards disorder and therefore fail to present proposals for the common good —rather for their own interests or those of the control system—, resulting in erratic behaviors whose ethics are not aligned with organizational values. Leadership theories need to integrate ethics into the core of their contributions (Antonakis et al., 2004), as ethical leadership positively influences others (Grobler & Grobler, 2021)

4. CRITICAL ELEMENTS FOR DIGITAL LEADERSHIP: ETHICAL REFLECTION

If we accept that the current reality surpasses the traditional order and structures, the disruption of the digital world presents questions that go beyond the individual and the group. The circumstances of digitalization promote constant changes in a tremendously relational era where short-termism still determines leadership strategies and where the measurement and contribution of the long term is tremendously challenging and even complicated. There is a need for leadership that goes beyond national, supranational, or sector proposals (Michael Dukakis Institute, 2020), since the technological revolution leads to new imbalances that we have to anticipate (Miller, 2018).

Organizations that interact now do so at a pace that can distort the relationship, generating a lack of trust and legitimacy. Based on traditional leadership theories, it is necessary to understand the continuous change in our environment and continue to be efficient in this endeavor (Bass & Avolio, 1994: Marion & Ulh-Bien, 2001; Posner & Kouzes, 1988). With this, the need for digital hyper connection, is causing leader credibility to suffer and group membership to be constantly questioned (Han, 2017). As a result, the old order gives way to a hybrid era where it is demonstrated that the human agent is still necessary in new processes and realities.

Chart 2 describes the historical evolution and how technology and its social integration have developed different management models and lead-

ership styles. Human beings are grouped together and led in each era by people who have contributed by being consistent with the concerns of society, their motivations, as well as the needs and motivations of the human group they represent. Currently, with opposing narratives, ideologies and models, there is a tendency towards 'ethification' (Van Dijk et al., 2021), that is imposing the rule of data, by regulating technology, the transfer or transformation of ideas into knowledge, as well as imposing data to social movements and organizations. The risks that the novel *1984* presented to us by George Orwell, which seemed dystopian, are real. The ethical leader, aware of the value of reflection and the ethical integration of different moralities and organizational models developed throughout history, can contribute by integrating the social dimensions that are present in the hybrid world - regardless of the management model under which he or she exercises this role.

Chart 2. Techno-cultural evolution and its leader

	Technology	Knowledge transfer	Management/ organization	Leadership
Gutenberg Era	Artesanal	University and ecclesiastical elites	Hierarchical and associative	**Charismatic**
Industrial Era	Chain production	Cooptation and specialization	Hierarchical and extractive	**Traditional**
Steve Jobs Era	Differentiation & innovation	Information age	Flat and individualistic	**Regulator**
Generative -Sustainable- Era	AI	Reflexive selection era	Decentralized and collaborative	**Generative**

In the current era, institutions and individuals are experiencing moments of crisis that affect their credibility and legitimacy. The institution is eroded by the dissociation of its ruling class (some would say privileged) from the reality of the rest of society. People suffer various mental imbalances due to immediacy and context. The growing inequality and the lack of concern for the underprivileged make us think that we are in a moment of institutional and personal disorganization.

Thus, there are two main problems for digital leadership. The first digital problem is that in institutions, there are more and more machines, more algorithms, more mechanization, and that makes us think about

the relationship between leaders and machines or leaders and systems. This is Kissinger's reflection. In general, we do not reflect on the relationship of leaders with people and, above all, among people. Ethical reflection is necessary in the face of the vulnerabilities of people and machines; to address the problem we will propose for ethical reflection the use of generativity as a creative process and a driver of capabilities. However, not only for AI, but also and above all for people and their communities. When conflicts arise in organizations or between people, the usefulness of generativity will differ from mechanistic transhumanism, as it strengthens relationships when the crisis appears. Therefore, we use narratives concerned with the relationship between people, i.e. community personalism incisive in the dialogue among a plurality of ethical possibilities. When ethical reflection is in place, mechanization and results are complementary to that concern, not its goal (Moyn, 2011).

A second problem is the need to rethink the concept of justice (O'Keefe, 2020). Social sciences, when they make use of ethics, help to understand human evolution in the search for the common good based on responsibility. This is achieved through mutual recognition in terms of principles of justice (Rawls, 2009). Mutual recognition marks the relationships between agents and between communities. When individual liberties are recognized, freedom is given to everyone. The individual contribution to the community generates collective value. The capable man's capacity for judgment (Casarotti, 2012) supposes reflecting in terms of responsibility by appropriating possibilities. This means disconnecting from the multitude of data and appropriating, by discerning, from among the multiple possibilities presented to the person. Rawls' reflective equilibrium, at the same time, allows the leader to integrate data and digital relationships while learning to disconnect as a prelude to decision making.

In the face of current tensions that require the integration of ethics, technology and leadership, thinking of solutions for the present and the future, the reflection of abstract thinking is necessary. The appropriation from the judgment of the capable person and the relationship from an otherness that allows the person to put himself in the place of the other at micro, meso and macro levels, is what allows us to think that ethical leadership has a place in the digital reality. How is the future built?

The reality of generative AI presents an opportunity to reflect on generativity. The concept of generativity was born from the psychology of the 1950s after World War II when there was a concern for guiding

the next generation in learning from crisis (Erikson, 1985). Generativity reconciles the crisis through questioning among people as part of organizational growth (Iula, 2019) by transferring what is valued (Saint Aubin et al., 2004). From current generative technology models such as ChatGPT (OpenAI, 2022) the conversion of information and data into generative responses tries to prepare us for the future. This reality of the present technology is based on a mathematical process described in the 1970s according to which "the hypothesis is that human learning with understanding is a generative process involving the construction of (a) organizational structures for storing and retrieving information, and (b) processes for relating new information to the stored information" (Wittrock,1974, p.182). Speed and storage are the two nuclear elements of the fourth revolution (Floridi, 2014).

The basic principle that makes data generativity critical today would be that the model may "be able to produce 'realistic' samples of training data, and, hopefully these samples will be sufficiently different from the original training data so as to be useful additional data points for the training of the model" (Jordon et al., 2022, p.30). Leaving the future to the fate of the results does not seem to be the best option. In the first place, simulation does not reflect, so it does not have the moral capacity nor the conscience of people (Niculiu & Cotofana, 2001); there is no moral status for AI technologies (Bostrom & Yudkowsky, 2011). AI simulation edits decision making as an amendment of human imperfections (Lassalle, 2024), as if there were no need for reflection. Simulation in that sense assimilates repetitive machine learning actions, which means that there is no reflective action understood as conscience by human moral principles (Meissner, 2020). Secondly, building the future by taking care of those who are yet to come assumes that generativity transforms the process itself (Hung et al., 2023; Steinbock, 1995).

In short, the proposed technological generativity is the principle that drives machine learning. A proposal for generativity and ethical leadership contemplates learning as an enabling phenomenon (Beth et al., 2015). This generativity integrates ethics, leadership and technology from reflection. Currently, to think of a leader who is not a person makes no sense for any humanistic proposal (Carbonell-Valin & Domingo, 2022). However, considering transhumanist proposals where humans are objects for management (Bostrom, 2016a; 2016b), considering also the evolution towards digital knowledge - transposing specialist for mechanization (Susskind & Susskind, 2018) -, all those proposals point to a much more

efficient management using AI. What must be recognized is the need for coordination between machine agents - super intelligent AI- and people to control systems (Future of Life Institute, 2017). However, controlling does not mean leading. Reflection is one of the pillars that should support ethical leadership and build a future from human dimensions. Ethical leadership dimensions are reflected on other people's attitudes (Karim & Nadeem, 2019).

Human centrality and its relations is not a new subject, but it is necessary to recover the reflective element, since mechanization imposes regulatory controls that exclude questioning. As a reflective element, ethics is not mechanical, but means integrating objectives, values and virtues. To this end, management opens the possibility of rethinking industry 4.0 through leadership, the uprising of ethics in leadership as a core dimension that divides leader behaviors from leader evaluations (Fischer, Dietz & Antonakis, 2024).

Humanistic management helps to integrate ethical reflection in the era of digital leadership. It is not the only option when it comes to leading, but it introduces human centrality as a counterbalance to digital mechanization. By giving effect to the new role of leadership alongside AI, generativity allows creativity to become preeminent through human and organizational growth. There is a generative dimension that permeates this role by integrating ethical traditions (Domingo Moratalla, 2022; Iula 2020).

5. PAST, PRESENT AND FUTURE. CAPACITY FOR GENERATIVE REFLECTION

Leaders are slaves of their time and the context that influences human groups. The narrative of control and utilitarianism is in crisis, so, the narrative integration of person and community has been presented from a proposal that merges ethics, leadership and technology.

The context is uncertain and its elements, which influence leadership, are identified and categorized but not conveniently measured, (Oc, 2018). Defining context as static through 'n' universally recognizable variables, is not possible. They are active variables, but not recognizable (Porter & McLaughlin, 2006). Today the context is not only uncertain, but also presents tensions that leaders and institutions fail to manage, which generates great insecurity.

Technology and mechanization seek efficiency and control from the logic of data. People have sought in technology the security to face the challenges of the context. Traditional leadership theories have helped to resolve tensions between the person and the organization, between the leader and the group, but today technologies have changed the way people relate or behave.

Today, influence and decision making are not only performed by people and leaders, but by algorithms. Therefore, traditional leadership theories need to rethink the challenges of the hybrid world and have to use new narratives and reflections to resolve tensions.

To rethink traditional leadership theories, we must start from the fact that they were born in a certain context. Thus, transformational leadership is surpassed by the speed of AI in the quest to improve performance and results, since the changes are caused by technology, not so much by the leader. At the same time, the psychological self-determination of the individual has been surpassed by the autonomy of the machine agent, since the motivators that influenced the behavior of the person are now also determined by algorithms. The exemplary leader who inspires and is credible is constantly challenged by the assumed reliability of the data, which is changing constantly.

Another traditional theory that needs to rethink the influence of context in its postulates is that of leaders who solve complexity with more direct relationships. This complex leadership encounters misinformation and new problems in a loop that forces it to be solving situations depending on networks and data management models that make it difficult to reflect and integrate perspectives. The leader who bases everything on relationships and thus tries to change the social context is faced with a diversity of moralities that cannot be changed by his particular ethics or those of his group. Finally, instrumental leadership conceives of integrating the method of transformational measurement to quantify the results of a leader from the context. The problem with this and all leadership theories is that the methods do not take into account human vulnerabilities, nor an agent such as machines, which change not only people but also the context.

The leader's values, whatever they may be, and regardless of the leadership model, cannot accommodate to the speed of changes in this given context: the leader not only does, but also is. It is not possible to mechanize human abstraction. Reflection, disconnection is an intrinsically human process. The value and competitive advantage added by

leadership is given by the leader's ability to know how to do and know how to be. The value of intangibles is reflected in ethical leadership. For today's reality, there is no leadership that is not ethical. Generative AI, taken as an example for our reflection, generates information and provides answers regardless of whether they are correct and ethical, since it is a question of obtaining results. If the results are not true or ethical, the leader and the organization fail in their social contribution to future generations. The social imbalance pointed out by Kissinger is fostered by authoritarianisms (which are a reflection of regulations that restrict individual freedoms and monopolies that suffocate other business models), as well as by technologies such as AI that generate capabilities that overlap some human capabilities.

We could define a leader not only as a person who influences others - the basis of traditional leadership - but also as a person who knows how to integrate ethics and technology - the basis of generative or future leadership. Ethics and technology are transversal human dimensions. Ethics is a human quality that neither animals nor robots or AI possess. Ethics is justification as Rawls (2009) or Cassarotti (2012) point out. It is also rationalization by allowing reflection and giving account and reason for action. Ethics validates action, orients it, analyzes it and allows it to appropriate possibilities - of what is to come. Ethics makes it possible to evaluate consequences, forging people's character and capacities. The "ethos" means forging a second nature. Ethics, in short, is not an "add-on" to be integrated, it is intrinsic to humanity. This is why we speak of a leader who is ethical, or who is not a leader.

When traditional influencers of the 20th century political world like Kissinger, of the 21st century business world like Schmidt, and of the prestigious academic elite like Huttenlocher predict that "leadership is likely to concentrate in hands of the fewer people and institutions who control access to the limited number of machines capable of high-quality synthesis of reality" (Kissinger et al. 2023, p.9,10), we need to rethink what means to lead.

To this end, reflecting on the transversality of ethics and technology in leadership means reflecting generationally (Volckmann, 2014) on whether the common good is protected. This is perceived when the leader respects and makes freedom flourish (Snow, 2015), from the conscience or ability to discern, as well as being able to disconnect, reflect and decide voluntarily whether to choose a path or not. Generativity enhances authenticity: The leaders can be unique if they can

freely develop their own capabilities and those of others. Generativity and reflection are integrated dimensions that must be considered by the leadership of the present and the future, understood in a generational trace, in a relational key, as an indication of sustainability and empowering both for the leader and for the rest of the people who fusion the natural and virtual reality (Carbonell-Valin & Domingo, 2023).

Public administrations could become much more accessible (not to be confused with the digitizing trend), companies could empower middle management, and leaders could become aware that it is not a matter of control, but of collaboration. One of the ways that can add value to the discussion on leadership of the future is to promote ideas to foster leadership 'among' people. It is not a hierarchical issue or a model where the leader monitors or mentors 'beside': The balance between the parties is reflected in the moral baggage of society (Etzioni, 1996) It is the between -among- a space for the I and you (Buber,2002), where an exchange of gifts is presented (Carbonell-Valín & Domingo Moratalla, 2022).

It is from the 'between' that it is necessary to find out if ethical leadership makes sense in an era of hyper-speed and hyper-connectivity. In the analysis of traditional leadership theories the danger of asymmetrical relationships was pointed out, since they produce inequalities. It is from the capacity of judgment (Casarotti, 2012; Rawls, 2009), that the members of a community can become leaders today and tomorrow.

Relationships, which are fundamental in communitarian personalism, are key when respect for ethics in a political community is given. To this end, the citizen is free to choose the ethics by which he is governed in the face of any kind of coercion (Cortina, 2012).

The Kissinger, Schmidt and Huttenlocher 2023 forecast of generativity and ChatGPT developments and the behavior of leaders in recent years, makes it necessary to present a plea for freedom from a responsible, reflective leadership where continuous learning makes the leader authentic and able to integrate realities (Carbonell-Valín & Domingo Moratalla, 2022). If the leader is honest from the truth -understanding that the hybrid reality responds and integrates both a natural worldview such as the noosphere (Teilhard de Chardin, 1959), as well as an artificial worldview such as the infosphere (Floridi, 2014) -, the construction of a better world is possible. This is what generativity is all about. It is for this challenge that we propose a complementary leadership to the traditional ways of leading.

REFERENCES

Antonakis, J., Day, D. V., & Schyns, B. (2012). Leadership and individual differences: At the cusp of a renaissance. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 23(4), 643-650.

Antonakis, J. E., Cianciolo, A. T., & Sternberg, R. J. (2004). Leadership: Past, present and future. In *The nature of leadership*. Sage Publications, Inc.

Antonakis, J., & House, R. (2014). Instrumental leadership: measurement and extension of transformational-transactional leadership theory. *The leadership quarterly, 25*, 746-771.

Arendt, H. (2013). *The human condition*. University of Chicago press.

Aromataris, E., & Pearson, A. (2014). The systematic review: an overview. *AJN The American Journal of Nursing, 114*(3), 53-58.

Avolio, B., & Bass, B. M. (1995). Individual consideration viewed at multiple levels of analysis: a multilevel framework for examining the diffusion of transformational leadership. *Leadership Quarterly, 6*(2), 199-218.

Bass, & Avolio. (1994). *Improving organizational effectiveness through transformational leadership*. (B. M. Bass, Ed.) Sage.

Bass, B. M. (1990). From transactional to transformational leadership: Learning to share the vision. *Organizational Dynamics, 18*(3), 19-31.

Beth, A. D., Jordan, M. E., Schallert, D. L., Reed, J. H., & Kim, M. (2015). Responsibility and generativity in online learning communities. *Interactive Learning Environments*, 23(4), 471-484.

Borji, A. (2023). A Categorical Archive of ChatGPT Failures. Retrieved 02 28, 2023.

Bostrom, N. (2016a). *Superinteligencia: Caminos, peligros, estrategias*. Zaragoza, Teell Editorial.

Bostrom, N. (2016b). The control problem. Excerpts from superintelligence: Paths, dangers, strategies. *Science Fiction and Philosophy: From Time Travel to Superintelligence*, 308-330.

Bostrom, N., & Yudkowsky, E. (2011). The ethics of artificial intelligence. En *The Cambridge Handbook of Artificial Intelligence*. William Ramsey and Keith Frankish.

Buber, M. (2002). *Between man and man*. Psychology Press.

Carbonell-Valín, M., & Domingo Moratalla, A. (2022). Renovated leadership for the XXI Century: complexity, uncertainty and trust on the digital era. In K. N. Engemann, K. J. Engemann, & C. W. Scott, *Organizational Risk Management*. De Gruyter.

Carbonell-Valin, M., & Domingo, A. (2023). La reinvención del liderazgo en la era digital. Del liderazgo humanista al liderazgo generativo. Cadiz: Eben.

Casarotti, E. (2012). The Capable Man: Anthropological Keys on P. Ricoeur's Ethical and Political Thinking. *13*(2), 266.

Chua, V., Madej, J., & Wellman, B. (2011). Personal communities: the world according to me. In J. Scott, & P. J. Carrington, *The SAGE handbook of social network analysis*. SAGE publications.

Clarke, J. M. (2017). Dispositional Attribution of Corporate Executives: Is Self-Interest a Conscious Decision or a State of Mind? In A. Rink, & J. Rendtorff, *Perspectives on Philosophy of Management and Business Ethics* (pp. 139-164). Springer.

Clarke, J. (2022). *Psychology of Leadership – Disordered & Destructive Leadership & the Dark Triad of Personality*. Julian Martin Clarke.

Coeckelbergh, M. (2020). *AI Ethics*. The MIT Press.

Cortina, A. (2012). *Encouraging coherency between visions and behaviours – In search of moral resources for sharing social responsibilities. Shared social responsibility: Putting theory into practice.* 57.Council of Europe Publishing.

Cullen-Lester, K. L., Maupin, C. K., & Carter, D. R. (2017). Incorporating social networks into leadership development: A conceptual model and evaluation of research and practice. *The Leadership Quarterly* (28), 130-152.

Day, D. V., Fleenor, J. W., Atwater, L. E.; Sturm, R. E., & McKee, R. A. (2014). Advances in leader and leadership development: A review of 25 years of research and theory. *The Leadership Quarterly, 25*(1), 63-82.

de Klerk, S. & Kroon, J. (2008). Business networking relationships for business success. *South African Journal of Business Management, 39*(2).

DeCanio, S. J. (2016). Robots and humans–complements or substitutes? *Journal of Macroeconomics, 49*, 280-291.

Domingo-Moratalla, A. (2022a). *Homo Curans. El coraje de cuidar*. Madrid: Ediciones Encuentro.

Domingo-Moratalla, A., Feyto, L., & Domingo-Moratalla, T. (2023). Mediterranean autonomy: Relational, narrative and careful. *XIX*. Ostium XIX.

D'Arienzo, M. C., Boursier, V. & Griffiths, M. D. (2019). Addiction

to social media and attachment styles: A systematic literature review. *International Journal of Mental Health and Addiction*. 17, 1094-1118.

Erikson, E. H. (1985). *Childhood and society*. London: Vintage books.

Etzioni, A. (1996). *The new golden rule*. HarperCollins Publishers.

Fischer, T., Dietz, J., & Antonakis, J. (2024). A fatal flaw: Positive leadership style research creates causal illusions. *The Leadership Quarterly* https://doi.org/10.1016/j.leaqua.2023.101771

Floridi, L. (2014). *The 4th revolution. How the infosphere is reshaping human reality*. Oxford.

Froissart, C. (2019). From outsiders to insiders: The rise of China EN-GOs as new experts in the law-making process and the building of a technocratic representation. *Journal of Chinese Governance, 4*(3), 207-232.

Future of Life Institute. (2017). *Future of Life Institute*. Retrieved from https://futureoflife.org/superintelligence-survey/

Gamarra, M. P., & Girotto, M. (2022). Ethical behavior in leadership: A bibliometric review of the last three decades. *Ethics & Behavior*, *32*(2), 124-146.

Gardner, H. (2011). *Frames of mind: The theory of multiple intelligences*. Basic Books.

Green, B. P. (2018). The technology of holiness: A response to Hava Tirosh-Samuelson. *Theology and Science*, *16*(2), 223-228.

Gonzalez, C. F. (2021). *El gran sueño de China. Tecno-socialismo y capitalismo de Estado*. Madrid: Tecnos.

Goswami, A., O'Brien, K. E., Dawson, K. M., & Hardiman, M. E. (2018). Mechanisms of corporate social responsibility: The moderating role of transformational leadership. *Ethics & Behavior*, *28*(8), 644-661.

Grobler, S., & Grobler, A. (2021). Ethical leadership, person-organizational fit, and productive energy: A South African sectoral comparative study. *Ethics & Behavior*, *31*(1), 21-37.

Han, B. (2017). *In the swarm: Digital prospects*. MIT Press.

Harari, Y. (2018). *21 lessons for the 21st century: 'Truly mind-expanding.Ultra-topical'*. Random House.

Harris, J. D., Quatman, C. E., Manring, M. M., Siston, R. A., & Flanigan, D. C. (2014). How to write a systematic review. *The American journal of sports medicine, 42*(11), 2761-2768.

Hung, N., Chen, Y. C., Choy Yung, R. M., Kwan, M. S., To, A. K., Fung, E. S., & Chan, C. L. (2023). Generativity in later-life: The

interplay between retirement status and human, social, and financial capital. *Journal of Gerontological Social Work*, 1-20.

Iula, E. (2019). Istituzioni giuste e istituzioni generative: un confronto con Paul Ricoeur. *Rassegna di Teologia, 60*(3), 433-456.

Iula, E. (2020). *Noi figli della descostruzione. Saggio di etica generativa*. Edizioni Efesto.

Ivanov, D. (2022). The Industry 5.0 framework: viability-based integration of the resilience, sustainability, and human-centricity perspectives. *International Journal of Production Research*, 1-13.

Jones, N. (2018, 09 13). How to stop data centres from gobbling up the world's electricity. The energy-efficiency drive at the information factories that serve us Facebook, Google and Bitcoin. *Nature*. Retrieved from https://www.nature.com/articles/d41586-018-06610-y?utm_source=substack&utm_medium=email

Jordon, J., Szpruch, L., Houssiau, F., Bottarelli, M., Cherubin, G., Maple, C., ... Weller, A. (2022). Synthetic Data–what, why and how? (T. A. Institute, Ed.) Retrieved from arXiv:2205.03257

Karim, S., & Nadeem, S. (2019). Understanding the unique impact of dimensions of ethical leadership on employee attitudes. *Ethics & Behavior*, *29*(7), 572-594.

Kissinger, H. (2022). *Leadership: Six studies in world strategy*. London: Penguin books.

Kissinger, H., Schmidt, E., & Huttenlocher, D. (2023, 02 24). ChatGPT Heralds an Intellectual Revolution. *The Wall Street Journal*. Retrieved 01 01, 2023, from https://www.wsj.com/articles/chatgpt-heralds-an-intellectual-revolution-enlightenment-artificial-intelligence-homo-technicus-technology-cognition-morality-philosophy-774331c6

Kouzes, J. M., & Posner, B. Z. (2002). *The leadership challenge*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Lassalle, J. M. (2024) *Civilización artificial*. Barcelona: Arpa Editores

Leturc, C., & Bonnet, G. (2022). Reasoning about manipulation in multi-agent systems. *Journal of Applied Non-Classical Logics*, *32*(2-3), 89-155.

Mannion, Lee. 2018. "Britain appoints minister for loneliness amid growing isolation." Reuters. January 17. https://www.reuters.com/article/us-britain-politics-health/ britain-appoints-minister-for-loneliness-amid-growing-isolation-idUSKBN- 1F61I6.

Marion, R., & Uhl-Bien, M. (2001). Leadership in complex organizations. *The Leadership Quarterly, 12*(4), 389-418.

Meissner, G. (2020). Artificial intelligence: consciousness and conscience. *AI & Society*, 35, 225-235.

Melé, D. (2009). Editorial introduction: towards a more humanistic management. *Journal of Business Ethics, 88*, 413-416.

Michael Dukakis Institute. (2020). *Artificial Intelligence and democratic values. The AI Social Contract Index 2020*. Center for AI and Digital policy. Retrieved 03 05, 2022.

Miller, R. (2018) Transforming the future: anticipation in the 21st century. ISBN: 978-92-3-100268-7 Corporate author: UNESCO.

Moyn, S. (2011). *Personalism, community, and the origins of human rights* 85-106. Ed. Stefan-Ludwig Hoffmann. Cambridge University Press https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9780511921667.007

Msiska, B., & Nielsen, P. (2018). Innovation in the fringes of software ecosystems: the role of socio-technical generativity. *Information Technology for Development, 24*(2), 398-421.

Niculiu, T., & Cotofana, S. (2001). Hierarchical intelligent simulation. *Proceedings of the European Simulation Multiconference*, 6-9.

Oc, B. (2018). Contextual leadership: A systematic review of how contextual factors shape leadership and its outcomes. *The Leadership Quarterly, 29*(1), 218-235.

Oc, B., & Bashshur, M. R. (2013). Followership, leadership and social influence. *The Leadership Quarterly, 24*(6), 919-934.

OpenAI. (2022, 11 30). *ChatGPT*. Retrieved 01 07, 2023, from ChatGPT: https://chat.openai.com/

Ospina, S. M., Foldy, E. G., Fairhurst, G. T., & Jackson, B. (2020). Collective dimensions of leadership: Connecting theory and method. *Human Relations, 73*(4), 441-463.

O'Keefe, D. F., Howell, G. T., & Squires, E. C. (2020). Ethical leadership begets ethical leadership: exploring situational moderators of the trickle-down effect. *Ethics & Behavior, 30*(8), 581-600.

Piaget, J. (1964). Cognitive development in Children: Piaget development and learning. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching, 2*, 176-186.

Pirson, Goodpaster, & Dierksmeier. (2016). Guest editors' introduction: Human dignity and business. *Business Ethics Quarterly, 26*(4), 465-478.

Pizarro Contreras, R. (2023). Artificial intelligence or the challenge of the century: Anatomy of a radical antihumanism. *Cognition, Technology & Work, 1*(3).

Porter, L. W., & McLaughlin, G. B. (2006). Leadership and the or-

CARBONELL-VALIN ET AL.
EVOLUTION OF LEADERSHIP: RETHINKING FROM ETHICS THE TRANSITION
FROM CHARISMA TO GENERATIVITY IN THE TIME OF ARTIFICIAL INTELLIGENCE

59

ganizational context: like the weather? *The Leadership Quarterly, 17*(6), 559-576.

Posner *&* Kouzes. (1988). Development and validation of the leadership practices inventory. *Educational and Psychological Measurement, 48*(2), 483-496.

Rawls, J. (2009). *A theory of justice*. Harvard University Press.

Ricoeur, P. (2007). *The course of recognition*. Harvard University Press.

Ryan, R., *&* Deci, E. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social developoment and well being. *55*(1), 68-78.

Sadin, É. (2020). *La Inteligencia Artificial o el desafío del siglo. Anatomía de un antihumanismo radical*. Buenos Aires: Caja Negra editora.

Saint Aubin, D., McAdams, D., *&* Kim, T. (2004). The generative society: An epilogue. In Saint Aubin, D. P. McAdams, *&* T.-C. Kim, *The generative society: caring for future generations*. http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/10622-017

Sætra, H. S. (2020). A shallow defence of a technocracy of artificial intelligence: Examining the political harms of algorithmic governance in the domain of government. *Technology in Society, 62*(101283).

Smith, A. M., *&* Green, M. (2018). Artificial intelligence and the role of leadership. *Journal of Leadership Studies, 12*(3), 85-87.

Snow, N. (2015). Generativity and flourishing. *Journal of Moral Education, 44*(3), 263-277.

Sparrowe, R. T., *&* Liden, R. C. (1997). Process and structure in leader-member exchange. *Academy of Management Review, 22*(2), 522-552.

Steinbock, A. J. (1995). *Home and beyond: Generative phenomenology after Husserl*. Northwestern University Press.

Susskind, D., *&* Susskind, R. (2018). The future of the professions. *Proceedings of the American Philosophical Society, 162*(2), 125-138.

Teilhard de Chardin, P. (1959). The formation of the noösphere. (I. b. Doubleday, Ed.) *The future of man*, 165. Retrieved from https://www.organism.earth/library/document/formation-of-the-noosphere

Uhl-Bien, M., Marion, R., *&* McKelvey, B. (2007). Complexity Leadership Theory: Shifting leadership from the industrial age to the knowledge era. *The Leadership Quarterly, 18*(4), 298-318.

Ulh-Bien, M. (2006). Relational Leadership Theory: Exploring the social processes of leadership and organizing. *The Leadership Quarterly, 17*(6), 654-676.

Ulh-Bien, M., & Arena, M. (2017). Complexity leadership: enabling people and organizations for adaptability. *Organizational Dynamics, 46*, 9-20.

Van Dijk, N., Casiraghi, S., & Gutwirth, S. (2021). The 'Ethification' of ICT Governance. Artificial Intelligence and Data Protection in the European Union. *Computer Law & Security Review, 43*(105597).

Vantrepotte, Q., Berberian, B., Pagliari, M., & Chambon, V. (2022). Leveraging human agency to improve confidence and acceptability in human-machine interactions. *Cognition, 222*(105020). doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cognition.2022.105020.

Volckmann, R. (2014). Generativity, transdisciplinarity, and integral leadership. *World Futures*, *70*(3-4), 248-265.

Webb, A. (2019). *The big nine: How the tech titans and their thinking machines could warp humanity*. Hachette.

Weber, M. (2009). *The theory of social and economic organization*. Simon and Schuster.

Wellman, N. (2017). Authority or community? A relational models theory of group level leadership emergence. *Academy of Management review, 42*(4), 596-617.

West, K. (2022). Prudent Entrepreneurship in Theory of Moral Sentiments. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 1-24. https://doi:10.1017/beq.2022.19

Wittrock, M. C. (1974). A generative model of mathematics learning. *Journal for Research in Mathematics Education*, 181-196.

Zamagni, S. (2014). The economy of communion project as a challenge to standard economic theory. *Revista Portuguesa de Filosofia*, 44-60.

Zamagni, S., & Bruni, L. (2013). *Handbook on the economics of philanthropy, reciprocity and social enterprise*. Edward Elgar Publishing.

Zuboff, S. (2019). *The age of surveillance capitalism. The Fight for a Human Future at the New Frontier of Power*. New York: Public Affairs.

Miguel Carbonell-Valin
School of Economics and Social Science
University of Santiago de Compostela
mcarbonell@com.uvigo.es
ORCID: 0000-0001-6306-1626

Agustín Domingo-Moratalla
School of Philosophy
University of Valencia
agustin.domingo@uv.es
ORCID: 0000-0001-8848-3761

Gloria Caballero
School of Economics and Business
University of Vigo
gloriacf@uvigo.es
ORCID: 0000-0003-0431-5977