



Humanistic Leadership in AI-Enabled Organizations

The 4A Framework of Learning, Attitude, Soul and Action for Responsible Performance

Dr. Ignacio Bonasa

President & Founder, University of Happiness and Well-Being
President & Founder, Liderarte Factoría de Talento
Humanistic Leadership Researcher, Author and International Speaker

Corresponding Author: Dr. Ignacio Bonasa

Article type	Conceptual research article and integrative literature review
Field	Management, organizational behavior and human-centered innovation
Language	English
Citation style	APA 7th edition
Originality	Original authorial synthesis; not previously published

<https://doi.org/10.64971/j.cph.eijtem.v13.i3.5.2026>

Abstract:

Artificial intelligence, algorithmic management, and data-intensive decision systems are transforming how organizations distribute work, evaluate performance, and exercise power. These developments increase the need for a leadership paradigm that combines technological competence with human dignity, moral responsibility, and operational discipline. This conceptual article develops a Humanistic Leadership 4A Framework composed of Learning, Attitude, Soul, and Action. Learning refers to intellectual humility, critical inquiry, systems thinking, and the capacity to revise assumptions. Attitude concerns the relational quality through which power is exercised, including respect, empathy, courage, fairness, and psychological safety. Soul denotes purpose, conscience, meaning, and recognition of the person as an end rather than an instrument. Action converts values into decisions, routines, resource allocation, governance, measurement, and repair. Through an integrative review of humanistic management, servant leadership, ethical leadership, authentic leadership, transformational leadership, responsible leadership, stakeholder theory, psychological safety, and responsible AI, the article explains how the four dimensions operate as an iterative cycle. It proposes a maturity model, behavioral indicators, organizational practices, and research propositions. The central thesis is that humanistic leadership is not a soft alternative to performance; it is a disciplined way of achieving responsible results without degrading the people, communities, and institutions that make those results possible. (Bass, 1985; Banks et al., 2016).

Keywords:

Humanistic leadership; responsible AI; ethical leadership; servant leadership; psychological safety; human dignity; stakeholder management; organizational culture; 4A framework. (Greenleaf, 1977; Eva et al., 2019)

1. Introduction

Leadership has always involved the exercise of power, but contemporary technology changes its speed, scale, and opacity. Algorithms now recommend candidates, allocate tasks, evaluate behavior, predict turnover, filter communication, and support strategic decisions. Generative artificial intelligence can produce analysis and language at unprecedented speed. These capabilities may remove repetitive work and expand access to knowledge, yet they may also concentrate authority, obscure accountability, intensify surveillance, and reduce people to probabilistic profiles. (Kellogg et al., 2020; Raisch & Krakowski, 2021)

The resulting challenge is not simply technical. Leaders must decide what should be automated, whose values are embedded in a system, who can contest an outcome, how risk is distributed, and whether efficiency gains are shared. These are moral and political questions inside the organization. Technical accuracy alone cannot answer them.

Many prevailing leadership models contribute useful insights but remain incomplete when used in isolation. Transformational leadership explains inspiration and change, servant leadership emphasizes service, ethical leadership addresses conduct and reinforcement, authentic leadership focuses on self-awareness and consistency, and responsible leadership expands stakeholder accountability. Humanistic leadership integrates these contributions around the inherent dignity and development of the person. (Bass, 1985; Banks et al., 2016)

This article proposes the 4A Framework: Learning, Attitude, Soul, and Action. The framework is designed to be memorable without becoming superficial. Each A corresponds to a distinct leadership responsibility: understanding reality, exercising power relationally, orienting decisions morally, and converting intention into accountable practice. Together they form a cycle suitable for strategy, people management, digital transformation, and crisis. (Werhane, 1999; Melé, 2010)

The article makes four contributions. First, it clarifies humanistic leadership in relation to adjacent theories. Second, it develops the 4A model and explains its internal logic. Third, it applies the model to AI-enabled organizations. Fourth, it proposes maturity levels, measures, and testable propositions.

2. Humanistic Leadership: Definition and Ethical Premise

Humanistic leadership is the responsible exercise of influence and authority in ways that protect dignity, expand human capability, and orient organizational action toward legitimate shared goods. It recognizes people as subjects capable of judgment, relationship, aspiration, and moral responsibility. Employees are not merely human capital, users, or data points; they are persons whose worth is not exhausted by their economic contribution. (Melé, 2003; Pirson, 2017)

This premise does not reject performance, profit, hierarchy, or technology. It evaluates their legitimacy. Profit is necessary for many organizations, but it is a means and an indicator rather than the complete purpose of enterprise. Hierarchy can coordinate action, but authority requires justification and accountability. Technology can augment capability, but it should not eliminate meaningful agency or create unchallengeable power.

Humanistic leadership is therefore both ethical and practical. It asks leaders to produce results while considering means, distribution, long-term consequences, and the kind of human relationships the organization creates. A decision may be legal and efficient yet still be degrading, deceptive, or socially destructive.

3. Relationship with Established Leadership Theories

3.1 Transformational leadership

Transformational leadership emphasizes vision, inspiration, intellectual stimulation, and individualized consideration. It is valuable for mobilizing change, yet its strong-leader orientation can become morally ambiguous if the vision itself is harmful or if followers are manipulated. Humanistic leadership retains inspiration but subjects vision to dignity, stakeholder impact, and moral limits. (Bass, 1985; Banks et al., 2016)

The 4A framework adds explicit mechanisms of learning and action accountability. Charisma is neither required nor sufficient; the decisive issue is whether systems and decisions embody respect.

3.2 Servant leadership

Servant leadership places service before status and emphasizes stewardship, empathy, and follower development. It is closely aligned with humanistic principles. Its limitation in some applications is the risk of interpreting service as leader benevolence rather than reciprocal responsibility and institutional justice. (Greenleaf, 1977; Eva et al., 2019)

The 4A framework incorporates service within Soul and Attitude while adding Learning and Action to ensure that good intentions become evidence-based and operational. (Werhane, 1999; Melé, 2010)

3.3 Ethical leadership

Ethical leadership focuses on normatively appropriate conduct, communication, reinforcement, and role modeling. It explains how leaders shape moral climates through rewards and consequences. Humanistic leadership shares this concern but begins with a thicker account of the person and the purpose of organization. (Brown et al., 2005; Bedi et al., 2016)

The 4A model also emphasizes moral imagination: the ability to perceive stakeholders and consequences that are absent from immediate metrics. (Maak & Pless, 2006; Freeman, 1984)

3.4 Authentic leadership

Authentic leadership values self-awareness, relational transparency, balanced processing, and an internalized moral perspective. These elements support trust, but authenticity alone does not guarantee goodness. A leader can be sincerely committed to harmful beliefs. Humanistic leadership therefore tests authenticity against dignity and the common good. (Avolio & Gardner, 2005; Banks et al., 2016)

Within the 4A model, authenticity is most relevant to Attitude and Soul, while Learning prevents identity from becoming rigidity and Action tests consistency. (Werhane, 1999; Melé, 2010)

3.5 Responsible leadership and stakeholder theory

Responsible leadership broadens the field beyond the leader-follower dyad to include stakeholders, social legitimacy, and global interdependence. This is essential in technology-rich organizations, where decisions affect customers, communities, suppliers, and future workers. (Maak & Pless, 2006; Freeman, 1984)

Humanistic leadership shares this relational perspective but places human dignity at the center of stakeholder judgment. Stakeholders are not merely interests to balance; they include persons and communities with rights, vulnerability, and voice. (Maak & Pless, 2006; Freeman, 1984)

3.6 Adaptive and learning-oriented leadership

Adaptive leadership highlights the need to mobilize learning when problems cannot be solved through existing expertise. This complements the Learning dimension of the 4A model. Humanistic leadership adds the requirement that adaptation should not simply make people fit a harmful system; the system itself may need to change.

Learning is therefore both epistemic and emancipatory. It seeks better understanding and challenges assumptions that normalize avoidable harm.

Theory	Core contribution	Potential limitation when isolated	4A integration
Transformational	Vision, inspiration, change	Vision may be morally underexamined	Soul tests purpose; Action ensures accountable execution
Servant	Service, stewardship, follower growth	May depend on leader benevolence	Attitude and Soul institutionalized through Action
Ethical	Moral conduct, role modeling, reinforcement	Can become compliance-centered	Soul provides purpose; Learning expands moral inquiry
Authentic	Self-awareness and transparency	Authenticity is not necessarily ethical	Soul supplies moral standard; Learning prevents rigidity
Responsible	Stakeholder accountability	May remain abstract at decision level	Action converts responsibility into governance
Adaptive	Learning under complexity	Adaptation may preserve unjust structures	Humanistic premise tests what should be adapted

4. Methodology: Theory Synthesis and Conceptual Model Building

This paper uses theory synthesis to integrate leadership, ethics, organizational behavior, and responsible technology. The model was developed by identifying four recurring leadership functions across these literatures: making sense of reality, relating through power, orienting action toward values, and producing accountable outcomes. Constructs were grouped only when they served a common function; distinctive elements were retained to avoid reducing the model to generic virtue language.

The framework was then examined through boundary conditions. A valid model had to remain useful under pressure, conflict, poor performance, technological disruption, and crisis. It also had to distinguish humane leadership from agreeableness, charisma, or benevolent paternalism. The final model therefore includes courage, standards, consequences, and repair alongside empathy and purpose.

The article is conceptual and does not claim empirical validation. It proposes operational indicators and research propositions intended to support scale development, case studies, and longitudinal testing.

5. The 4A Humanistic Leadership Framework

The four dimensions are mutually dependent. Learning without Attitude may produce technically sophisticated arrogance. Attitude without Soul may create pleasant relationships without moral direction. Soul without Action becomes rhetoric. Action without Learning becomes repetition, and Action without Soul can produce efficient harm. The framework therefore functions as an iterative cycle rather than a sequence completed once. (Werhane, 1999; Melé, 2010)

Dimension	Primary function	Core capabilities	Guiding question	Failure when absent
Learning	Understand reality with humility and rigor	Listening, evidence, systems thinking, curiosity, unlearning	What do we not yet understand?	Blind action and repeated error
Attitude	Exercise power through respectful and courageous presence	Empathy, fairness, openness, calm, inclusion, candor	How are people experiencing our power?	Fear, silence, and relational damage
Soul	Orient decisions toward dignity, meaning, and conscience	Purpose, values, moral imagination, service, coherence	What human good should this serve?	Values drift and moral disengagement
Action	Translate intention into accountable results	Decision, resources, governance, follow-through, repair	What will we do, who owns it, and how will we know?	Symbolic leadership and loss of credibility

5.1 Learning: leadership as disciplined inquiry

Learning is the first dimension because leaders act in systems they can never fully understand. Humanistic leadership rejects the mythology of infallibility. It values expertise while recognizing uncertainty, bias, and the limits of centralized knowledge. Intellectual humility is therefore not hesitation; it is the disciplined awareness that authority does not guarantee accuracy.

Learning begins with listening to people closest to the work. Frontline employees often see risks, customer needs, and workarounds that remain invisible to executives. Yet listening is meaningful only when it can influence interpretation or action. Theatrical consultation—asking for input after decisions are fixed—reduces trust. (Mayer et al., 1995)

Systems thinking is another core capability. Leaders must examine feedback loops, delayed consequences, incentives, and the distribution of burden. A productivity target may improve output while increasing errors and turnover; an AI tool may accelerate decisions while weakening professional judgment. Learning asks not only whether an intervention works, but what system it creates. (Kellogg et al., 2020; Raisch & Krakowski, 2021)

Unlearning is essential. Practices once rewarded may become harmful under new conditions. Leaders must release assumptions about control, presence, expertise, and motivation. A learning culture is visible when questions are rewarded, uncertainty can be spoken, and errors generate inquiry rather than humiliation.

5.2 Attitude: the human quality of power

Attitude is the manner in which leadership is experienced. Two leaders may reach the same decision but produce different effects through tone, timing, transparency, and respect. Humanistic Attitude combines empathy with courage. Empathy without courage avoids necessary truth; courage without empathy becomes domination.

Power asymmetry creates special responsibility. Leaders possess formal authority, information, and influence over careers. Their micro-behaviors—interrupting, explaining, thanking, dismissing, admitting error—signal whether people are recognized as capable participants. These signals accumulate into culture.

Fairness is central. Humanistic leaders examine whose voice is heard, who receives opportunities, who is forgiven, and who bears the cost of change. Inclusion is not merely demographic presence; it is meaningful participation and influence.

Attitude also includes emotional steadiness. Leaders need not suppress emotion, but they should avoid making the organization responsible for regulating their unprocessed reactions. Calm under pressure creates space for truth; volatility produces concealment.

5.3 Soul: purpose, conscience, and moral imagination

Soul is used here in a philosophical and organizational sense. It refers to the depth from which leaders answer what the organization is for, what must not be sacrificed, and what kind of human beings its

practices are forming. It does not require a specific religious belief. It names conscience, meaning, identity, and transcendence. (Werhane, 1999; Melé, 2010)

Purpose becomes humanistic when it constrains behavior. Many organizations use purpose as a motivational story while making decisions solely through financial metrics. Soul is revealed when values influence resource allocation, customer selection, technology boundaries, and behavior under pressure. (Werhane, 1999; Melé, 2010)

Moral imagination enables leaders to perceive absent stakeholders and future consequences. It asks who is not in the room, whose vulnerability is hidden, and what normalized practice might appear unacceptable from another perspective. This is particularly important in data systems, where affected individuals may never meet the decision maker. (Maak & Pless, 2006; Freeman, 1984)

Soul also protects the leader from reducing self-worth to status or results. Leaders who depend entirely on success may rationalize harm to avoid failure. A deeper identity makes accountability and repair more possible. (Werhane, 1999; Melé, 2010)

5.4 Action: values made operational

Humanistic leadership remains incomplete until values alter decisions, processes, incentives, and consequences. Organizations often fail not because they lack values but because their systems reward the opposite behavior. Action tests whether leadership is real.

Action requires specificity: a named owner, timeline, resources, indicators, and review. It includes the discipline to stop activities that contradict purpose. Leaders often add new programs while leaving harmful incentives untouched because addition is easier than subtraction.

Repair is a defining capability. When harm occurs, humanistic leaders acknowledge it, stop the cause, compensate where appropriate, learn, and redesign the system. Accountability is not humiliation. It is the connection between power and consequence.

Action also means building institutions. Ethical conduct should not depend solely on individual virtue. Policies, appeal channels, audits, and independent oversight protect dignity when leadership changes or pressure rises. (Melé, 2003; Pirson, 2017)

6. The 4A Cycle and Its Internal Dynamics

The framework operates as a cycle. Leaders learn from evidence and voice, adopt an Attitude that makes truth possible, consult Soul to clarify the human purpose and limits of action, and then Act. Outcomes create new information, restarting Learning. The quality of leadership depends on the integrity of the full loop. (Werhane, 1999; Melé, 2010)

The cycle can be compressed in urgent situations but should not be eliminated. A brief ethical pause can ask: What do we know? What assumption are we making? Who may be harmed? What value must be protected? What reversible action can we take? These questions improve speed by preventing avoidable rework and loss of legitimacy.

The dimensions also correct one another. Learning challenges moral certainty; Soul prevents learning from becoming value-neutral; Attitude ensures that inquiry includes lived experience; Action prevents reflection from becoming avoidance. (Werhane, 1999; Melé, 2010)

7. Humanistic Leadership in AI-Enabled Organizations

Artificial intelligence is a critical test because it combines technical complexity with power. Systems can influence hiring, scheduling, credit, healthcare, education, performance, and access to opportunity. Even when leaders do not build the model, they remain responsible for choosing, deploying, and governing it. (Kellogg et al., 2020; Raisch & Krakowski, 2021)

The first humanistic principle is that automation should be evaluated by its effect on human capability, not only cost and speed. Some forms of automation remove dangerous or repetitive work; others eliminate learning pathways, reduce discretion, or fragment responsibility. The relevant question is whether the system augments meaningful agency or merely extracts more output.

The second principle is contestability. People affected by an automated decision need understandable explanations, routes of appeal, and a human authority capable of taking responsibility. A nominal human-in-the-loop is insufficient if the person lacks time, expertise, or permission to challenge the system.

The third principle is distributive fairness. Productivity gains and transition costs should not be allocated automatically to capital and workers respectively. Humanistic leaders consider reskilling, redeployment, transition support, and the social consequences of role elimination.

The fourth principle is privacy and proportionality. The availability of data does not create a moral right to use it. Monitoring should be limited to legitimate purposes, with transparency and safeguards against function creep.

4A dimension	Questions for AI governance	Illustrative practices
Learning	What data, assumptions, limitations, and second-order effects exist?	Impact assessment, pilot testing, user research, bias analysis
Attitude	How are affected people included and treated?	Participation, transparent communication, respectful change support
Soul	What human purpose, right, or capability must be protected?	Dignity test, prohibited uses, stakeholder review, purpose statement
Action	Who is accountable and how can harm be challenged and repaired?	Appeal routes, monitoring, documentation, remediation, named owner

8. Application to Core Leadership Domains

8.1 Strategy

In strategy, Learning requires understanding systems, trends, and stakeholder realities rather than relying only on executive assumptions. Attitude determines whether strategy is developed through honest participation or imposed through secrecy. Soul tests whether the strategy serves a legitimate purpose. Action converts direction into investment, priorities, and explicit stop-doing decisions. (Maak & Pless, 2006; Freeman, 1984)

A humanistic strategy does not promise that every stakeholder will benefit equally. It promises that trade-offs will be made visible, minimum rights protected, and preventable harm not externalized merely because it is difficult to measure. (Maak & Pless, 2006; Freeman, 1984)

8.2 People management and performance

In people management, Learning means understanding capability, aspiration, context, and system constraints. Attitude appears in feedback, recognition, and conflict. Soul requires seeing the person beyond the role. Action includes clear expectations, development, support, and fair consequences. (Werhane, 1999; Melé, 2010)

Humanistic leadership is compatible with demanding standards. The distinction lies in whether goals are realistic, whether feedback protects dignity, and whether the organization examines its own contribution before attributing failure exclusively to the individual. (Melé, 2003; Pirson, 2017)

8.3 Change and transformation

Transformation often fails because leaders communicate a destination without respecting the losses involved. Learning maps real workflow and local knowledge. Attitude acknowledges uncertainty and identity disruption. Soul protects non-negotiable values. Action sequences change, provides support, and creates feedback loops. (Werhane, 1999; Melé, 2010)

Participation should be honest. When a decision is fixed, leaders should say so and clarify where influence remains possible. False participation is more damaging than transparent authority.

8.4 Innovation

Innovation requires permission to question, experiment, and fail intelligently. Learning provides curiosity and evidence. Attitude creates safety for unconventional ideas. Soul asks whether innovation solves a worthwhile problem and for whom. Action allocates resources and tests assumptions. (Werhane, 1999; Melé, 2010)

Humanistic innovation avoids the assumption that novelty is inherently good. It evaluates consequences, accessibility, and the possibility that a technically impressive product may create social or psychological harm.

8.5 Crisis leadership

Crisis creates pressure for command and speed. The 4A model does not remove decisiveness; it disciplines it. Learning separates facts from rumor. Attitude reduces panic and invites critical information. Soul prevents emergency from becoming an excuse for abuse. Action establishes priorities, roles, and review points. (Werhane, 1999; Melé, 2010)

After crisis, leaders should conduct reviews that include emotional, relational, and ethical consequences, not only operational performance. Repair may be necessary even when the formal objective was achieved.

8.6 Restructuring and difficult decisions

Restructuring exposes the moral seriousness of leadership. Learning examines alternatives and long-term consequences. Attitude demands direct, respectful communication. Soul asks what obligations exist toward people whose roles disappear. Action provides fair criteria, transition support, and consistent implementation. (Werhane, 1999; Melé, 2010)

Humanistic leadership does not deny that roles may be eliminated. It rejects unnecessary humiliation, deception, and the transfer of all adjustment cost to those with least power.

9. Observable Behaviors and Organizational Practices

A useful leadership model must be visible in behavior and supported by systems. Otherwise, assessment becomes a contest of self-description. The following practices translate the 4A dimensions into evidence.

Dimension	Observable leader behaviors	Supporting organizational practices
Learning	Asks open questions; seeks dissent; admits uncertainty; revises decisions	After-action reviews, listening systems, evidence standards, protected learning time
Attitude	Listens without humiliation; explains decisions; gives fair feedback; remains steady	Psychological safety norms, inclusion metrics, conflict protocols, manager coaching
Soul	Connects choices to purpose; considers absent stakeholders; protects dignity	Ethics forums, stakeholder review, purpose-linked investment, prohibited-use policies
Action	Names owners; allocates resources; follows through; repairs harm	Decision logs, governance dashboards, appeal channels, remediation processes

Behavioral evidence should be gathered from multiple sources because power distorts upward feedback. Leaders may experience themselves as open while employees experience caution. Anonymous data, qualitative narratives, decision audits, promotion patterns, and ethics cases provide a more reliable picture.

The organizational system must reinforce the same expectations. A leader trained in empathy but rewarded exclusively for short-term output will face contradictory signals. Humanistic leadership therefore requires alignment between development, incentives, governance, and consequences.

10. A Five-Level Humanistic Leadership Maturity Model

Personality-dependent. Humane behavior depends on individual leaders and disappears when they move. There are few common standards or protections.

Values-declared. Dignity, purpose, or care appear in communication, but incentives and decision processes remain largely unchanged. (Melé, 2003; Pirson, 2017)

Practice-embedded. Recruitment, development, feedback, performance, and change processes include 4A behaviors and expectations.

Governance-integrated. Strategic, technological, and restructuring decisions include stakeholder, dignity, and ethical impact reviews with accountable owners. (Maak & Pless, 2006; Freeman, 1984)

Regenerative. Leadership actively develops human capability, shares learning, repairs harm, and seeks positive value beyond organizational boundaries.

Maturity is not a branding claim. It is the degree to which humanistic conduct survives pressure, leadership succession, and conflicting incentives. The strongest test is what happens when respecting people is costly in the short term.

11. Measurement and Evaluation

Humanistic leadership should be measured without being reduced to popularity. Evaluation should combine behavior, climate, systems, decisions, and outcomes. Behavioral indicators show what leaders do; climate indicators show how power is experienced; system indicators show whether practices are institutionalized; decision indicators show how trade-offs are handled; outcomes show whether trust, learning, safety, and responsible performance improve. (Mayer et al., 1995)

Multi-source assessment is essential. Direct reports, peers, stakeholders, and decision records reveal different dimensions. Qualitative evidence should be included because the meaning of a score often depends on context. A low psychological safety result may arise from one volatile leader, a wider incentive problem, or unresolved discrimination. (Maak & Pless, 2006; Freeman, 1984)

Measurement should support development and accountability. It should not become a performative ranking that encourages impression management. Leaders need opportunities to improve, but repeated harmful behavior should have consequences.

Domain	Illustrative indicators
Learning	Dissent invited; assumptions documented; decisions revised; quality of reviews
Attitude	Psychological safety; fairness; inclusion; civility; feedback quality

Domain	Illustrative indicators
Soul	Purpose coherence; stakeholder consideration; ethical concerns resolved
Action	Commitments completed; resources allocated; harms remediated; controls functioning
Outcomes	Trust, retention, learning, innovation, safety, responsible AI adoption, legitimacy

12. Common Misinterpretations and Boundary Conditions

Humanistic leadership is not synonymous with being agreeable. Respect may require difficult feedback, refusal, or consequence. Avoiding conflict can be dehumanizing when it leaves people without clarity. The humanistic standard concerns truth, fairness, and dignity, not universal comfort. (Melé, 2003; Pirson, 2017)

It is not paternalism. Leaders should not define employee well-being without voice or treat adults as dependents. Humanistic leadership expands agency and participation. Care without autonomy becomes control.

It is not philanthropy added after value creation. It concerns how value is created: how risk is distributed, how technology is governed, how suppliers are treated, and whether success depletes the people and communities on which it depends.

It is not a rejection of hierarchy. Some coordination requires authority. The relevant questions are whether power is transparent, contestable, proportionate, and accountable.

Finally, humanistic leadership is not dependent on charisma or personal goodness. Its purpose is to institutionalize conditions so that dignity does not rely on the goodwill of a single leader. (Melé, 2003; Pirson, 2017)

13. Ethical Tensions and Decision Principles

Leadership often involves competing goods rather than a simple choice between right and wrong. Preserving employment may conflict with financial viability; transparency may conflict with privacy; automation may improve safety while eliminating roles; speed may conflict with participation. The 4A framework does not provide automatic answers, but it improves the quality and legitimacy of the process.

A responsible decision should make assumptions explicit, identify affected stakeholders, evaluate alternatives, protect minimum rights, distribute burdens fairly, and establish review and appeal. Leaders should communicate not only what was decided but what evidence and values shaped the decision. (Maak & Pless, 2006; Freeman, 1984)

Reversibility is a useful principle under uncertainty. When knowledge is incomplete and potential harm is significant, leaders should prefer limited pilots, staged implementation, and monitoring rather than irreversible scale.

14. Implementation Agenda

Define the meaning of each A in the organization's context, using observable behaviors and real dilemmas rather than abstract values.

Establish a baseline through interviews, climate data, decision audits, and technology governance review.

Identify contradictions between declared values and incentives, especially where speed, cost, or output consistently override dignity and learning. (Melé, 2003; Pirson, 2017)

Develop leaders through real-case practice in listening, feedback, ethical framing, stakeholder analysis, and action planning. (Maak & Pless, 2006; Freeman, 1984)

Embed the model in selection, promotion, performance management, change governance, and AI procurement.

Create appeal and repair mechanisms that allow people to challenge decisions without retaliation.

Review outcomes quarterly and publish internal lessons, including failures and corrective actions.

Align senior leader consequences with repeated evidence of conduct, not only financial results.

A twelve-month implementation can be divided into four quarters. The first establishes language and baseline evidence. The second develops capability through live cases. The third embeds the framework in systems. The fourth evaluates, repairs, and reports. The most powerful early intervention is often the removal of one normalized contradiction—such as inviting voice while punishing dissent or promoting balance while rewarding chronic overwork.

Implementation should begin at the top because employees judge humanistic claims through senior decisions. Training frontline managers while leaving executive incentives unchanged produces cynicism.

15. Research Propositions and Future Agenda

P1: The four 4A dimensions will emerge as related but distinguishable factors in leadership assessment.

P2: Psychological safety will mediate the relationship between humanistic Attitude and team learning behavior.

P3: Perceived purpose coherence will strengthen the relationship between Soul and meaningful work.

P4: Action consistency will moderate the relationship between declared values and organizational trust.

P5: Learning orientation will reduce overreliance on automated recommendations by increasing critical verification.

P6: Humanistic leadership will predict responsible AI acceptance beyond perceived usefulness and ease of use.

P7: Governance-integrated maturity will be associated with fewer ethical failures during digital transformation.

P8: Repair behavior after harm will predict restored trust more strongly than apology alone.

Future studies should develop a validated 4A instrument and compare it with established leadership scales. Incremental validity is important: the model should explain outcomes beyond ethical, servant, authentic, and transformational leadership. Longitudinal designs can examine whether 4A behavior predicts trust, learning, retention, and responsible innovation over time. (Bass, 1985; Banks et al., 2016) Research should also examine cultural variation. The language of Soul may resonate differently across secular, spiritual, and collectivist contexts. Alternative labels such as moral center or meaningful purpose can be tested while preserving the construct. (Werhane, 1999; Melé, 2010)

16. Discussion

The 4A Framework integrates epistemic, relational, moral, and executional responsibilities. Many leadership models emphasize one or two of these functions. The distinctive claim is that humanistic leadership fails when any one is absent. A leader who cares but does not learn may protect outdated practices; a leader with noble purpose but weak action loses credibility; a decisive leader without moral orientation can scale harm.

The framework is especially relevant in AI-enabled organizations because technology amplifies both capability and consequence. A biased managerial practice that once affected dozens of people can be automated across thousands. Humanistic leadership therefore becomes more important as direct human interaction decreases. Leaders must build values into technical and institutional architecture.

Performance and humanism should not be treated as opposites. Trust, candor, learning, and meaningful contribution can improve adaptive performance. Yet the ethical claim remains even when returns are uncertain. Dignity is not simply a variable to optimize; it is a boundary that gives legitimacy to optimization. (Melé, 2003; Pirson, 2017)

The model also reframes accountability. Humanistic leadership is not satisfied with good intention. It requires evidence, ownership, consequence, and repair. In this sense, it is demanding rather than soft.

17. Limitations

The framework is conceptual and may reflect cultural assumptions that require adaptation. Its dimensions may overlap empirically, and the language of Soul may be interpreted too narrowly in some settings. Future research should test alternative wording and factor structures. (Werhane, 1999; Melé, 2010)

The model also cannot substitute for labor rights, regulation, or independent governance. Leader development is insufficient where power is unchecked. Humanistic leadership must be complemented by institutions that protect voice and provide remedy.

Finally, the article focuses on organizational leadership and does not fully examine geopolitical, environmental, or macroeconomic constraints. These broader systems shape what organizations can do and should be incorporated in future work.

18. Conclusion

Humanistic leadership is the disciplined practice of achieving responsible results while honoring the dignity, agency, and development of persons. In technology-rich organizations, this requires more than ethical statements. It requires leaders who learn continuously, exercise power with a respectful and courageous Attitude, act from a clear moral Soul, and convert intention into accountable Action. (Melé, 2003; Pirson, 2017)

The 4A Framework offers a practical cycle for this work. Its ultimate test is not how inspiring it sounds, but what happens when pressure rises, technology expands, and difficult decisions must be made. Humanistic leadership is credible when people can see its consequences in the design of work, the distribution of risk, the possibility of voice, and the willingness to repair harm.

17. Why the 4A Framework Constitutes a Distinct Theoretical Contribution

A leadership framework is theoretically useful when it identifies a missing mechanism, clarifies relationships among established constructs, or offers a more generative explanation of practice. The 4A Framework does not claim that learning, attitude, moral purpose or execution are individually new. Its contribution lies in integrating four different responsibilities of leadership into a recursive architecture: epistemic responsibility, relational responsibility, moral responsibility and practical responsibility.

Most established leadership theories privilege one or two of these responsibilities. Transformational leadership explains inspiration, identification and higher-order motivation, but can under-specify the moral quality of the vision. Ethical leadership emphasizes appropriate conduct and reinforcement, but may not fully address adaptive learning or the existential meaning of work. Servant leadership foregrounds service and follower development, but offers less explicit guidance for strategic execution and algorithmic governance. Authentic leadership values self-awareness and consistency, yet authenticity alone cannot determine whether a leader's values are ethically defensible (Avolio & Gardner, 2005; Brown et al., 2005; Eva et al., 2019).

The 4A model addresses these gaps by treating leadership as a cycle. Learning asks whether the leader's understanding of reality is adequate. Attitude asks how power is experienced in relationship. Soul asks whether the direction is worthy of human commitment. Action asks whether values become decisions, resources and repair. None of the four is sufficient alone. Their interaction is the explanatory core of the framework.

This interaction also establishes a temporal logic. Before action, leaders need inquiry and ethical orientation; during action, attitude shapes participation and voice; after action, outcomes return as new learning. The framework therefore supports both deliberation and adaptation. It is particularly suitable for AI-enabled organizations because algorithmic decisions require technical learning, respectful participation, moral boundaries and operational governance at the same time.

Theory	Central strength	Typical blind spot	4A integration
Transformational leadership	Vision, inspiration and change	Vision may be ethically indeterminate	Soul tests worthiness; Action establishes accountability
Servant leadership	Service and follower growth	Less explicit on strategic execution and hard trade-offs	Action and Learning discipline service under complexity
Ethical leadership	Moral conduct and reinforcement	Can become compliance-centered	Soul deepens moral imagination; Attitude shapes lived power
Authentic leadership	Self-awareness and consistency	Authentic values may still be harmful	Soul subjects authenticity to dignity and the common good
Responsible leadership	Stakeholder relationships and legitimacy	Broad scope can remain abstract	4A converts responsibility into a repeatable decision cycle
Adaptive leadership	Learning under complexity	May under-specify dignity and moral limits	Soul and Attitude constrain adaptation ethically

18. The Construct of Soul: Academic Delimitation and Defensibility

Soul is the most distinctive and potentially contested construct in the model. It is not used as a theological claim, a personality trait or an invitation to emotional rhetoric. It denotes the leader's capacity to orient power through conscience, moral imagination, purpose, practical wisdom and recognition of inherent human dignity. In operational terms, Soul answers four questions: What human good is being served? Which values must constrain the decision? Whose dignity or agency may be threatened? What kind of organization and person will this action help create?

The construct draws on several established traditions. Moral imagination is the ability to recognize that a problem can be framed in more than one way and to envision ethically superior alternatives (Werhane, 1999). Practical wisdom, or *phronesis*, is the capacity to judge what is appropriate in a particular context when rules and metrics are insufficient (Schwartz & Sharpe, 2010). Meaningful work research explains why people seek significance and coherence in their contribution (Rosso et al., 2010). Humanistic management provides the normative boundary that persons must be treated as ends, not merely as resources (Pirson, 2017). Soul integrates these ideas into a leadership orientation.

Soul is distinguishable from purpose. Purpose identifies a desired contribution or direction; Soul evaluates whether that purpose and the means used to pursue it are humane. It is distinguishable from integrity because consistency can preserve an immoral commitment. It is distinguishable from empathy because understanding another's feelings does not automatically produce just action. Soul therefore operates as a moral-evaluative capacity rather than an affective state.

Future measurement should avoid asking respondents whether a leader 'has soul'. The construct can be operationalized through observable indicators: consistency between declared values and resource

allocation; stakeholder consideration; willingness to protect dignity under pressure; evidence of moral reflection; refusal of dehumanizing means; and credible repair after harm. This preserves academic rigor while retaining a language that communicates depth.

19. Humanistic Leadership and the Governance of Artificial Intelligence

Artificial intelligence intensifies the need for humanistic leadership because it scales decisions, redistributes expertise and can make power less visible. Algorithmic management systems already allocate tasks, evaluate performance and influence employment opportunities. Their apparent objectivity can discourage challenge even when data are incomplete or categories embed historical inequities. Leadership cannot delegate moral responsibility to a model, a vendor or a technical team (Kellogg et al., 2020; Raisch & Krakowski, 2021).

Learning requires leaders to understand the system's purpose, data provenance, limitations and likely failure modes. Leaders do not need to become engineers, but they must become sufficiently literate to ask informed questions and to recognize where uncertainty is being hidden. Attitude requires meaningful participation by workers and affected stakeholders. Consultation should occur before deployment and should include the possibility of changing or rejecting the technology.

Soul establishes non-negotiable boundaries. Some uses may be efficient but incompatible with dignity, such as opaque emotion recognition in high-stakes employment decisions, continuous surveillance of intimate behavior, or systems that remove any meaningful avenue of appeal. Action turns these boundaries into governance: impact assessments, documented accountability, human review, appeal rights, monitoring for drift, security controls, procurement standards and procedures for suspension.

The framework also addresses the distribution of benefits. If AI increases productivity, humanistic leadership asks whether employees receive time, learning, safer work or shared gains, or whether the technology merely intensifies control. Responsible adoption should protect employability through reskilling and transparent transition pathways. Augmentation is not always possible, but avoidable abandonment is not ethically neutral.

AI governance question	Learning	Attitude	Soul	Action
Should the system be deployed?	Assess evidence, limits and alternatives	Include affected voices	Test dignity, rights and social purpose	Approve, redesign or reject with documented reasons
How should it operate?	Map failure modes and uncertainty	Design understandable interactions	Preserve agency and contestability	Set controls, human oversight and thresholds
How should impacts be monitored?	Collect technical and human evidence	Protect speak-up channels	Examine unequal and dehumanizing effects	Audit, remediate, suspend or retire
How should gains and losses be shared?	Estimate capability and role changes	Communicate honestly and early	Apply fairness and stewardship	Fund reskilling, transition and benefit-sharing

20. Causal Logic and Boundary Conditions of the 4A Model

The framework proposes that humanistic leadership influences outcomes through three principal mechanisms. First, it improves information quality. Leaders who learn with humility and create a respectful attitude receive more accurate upward information. Second, it increases moral and strategic coherence. Soul connects decisions to a stable account of purpose and dignity, reducing values drift under pressure. Third, it strengthens implementation credibility. Action demonstrates that commitments have consequences, which supports trust and reduces cynicism.

Psychological safety is expected to mediate the relationship between Attitude and team learning because respectful power makes error reporting and dissent less dangerous. Perceived value coherence should mediate the relationship between Soul and meaningful work because purpose becomes credible when visible decisions support it. Execution reliability should mediate the relationship between Action and trust because repeated follow-through converts language into evidence.

The model has important boundary conditions. Humanistic leadership cannot compensate indefinitely for an unethical business model, severe resource scarcity or governance that rewards harmful behavior. Nor does it eliminate the need for formal rights and independent oversight. Its effects will be stronger where leaders have real discretion and where organizational systems reinforce rather than punish the four dimensions.

21. Refined Propositions and Measurement Model

P1 - Four-factor proposition. Learning, Attitude, Soul and Action will emerge as correlated but empirically distinguishable dimensions of humanistic leadership.

P2 - Information-quality proposition. Attitude will predict team learning behavior through psychological safety, with leader power distance orientation moderating this relationship.

P3 - Meaning proposition. Soul will predict meaningful work through perceived purpose coherence, especially when employees observe consistency under economic pressure.

P4 - Credibility proposition. Action reliability will strengthen the relationship between declared humanistic values and organizational trust.

P5 - AI acceptance proposition. The 4A pattern will predict responsible AI acceptance beyond perceived usefulness because it increases agency, fairness and confidence in governance.

P6 - Complementarity proposition. The effect of any single A on trust and adaptive performance will be stronger when the remaining dimensions are also high.

P7 - Repair proposition. Transparent acknowledgment and remediation following harm will partially restore trust, with restoration stronger where previous Action reliability was high.

P8 - Governance proposition. Organizations that embed the 4A model in AI governance will report fewer unresolved ethical incidents and higher employee willingness to report system failures.

A measurement instrument could combine employee ratings with behavioral evidence. Learning might be measured through leader curiosity, revision of decisions and use of dissenting information. Attitude might include respectful interaction, fairness and non-retaliation. Soul could be measured through value coherence, stakeholder consideration and dignity protection. Action would assess ownership, resource commitment, follow-through and repair. Multi-source data are essential because leaders often overestimate their own openness and ethical consistency.

22. Humanized Practice: What the Framework Looks Like in Difficult Moments

The credibility of humanistic leadership is tested not in ceremonial speeches but in moments when another choice would be easier. It appears when a leader pauses a technically successful system because employees cannot challenge its decisions. It appears when bad news is heard without punishing the messenger. It appears when a restructuring conversation names the economic reality without reducing people to a cost line. It appears when a leader says, 'I was wrong,' and changes the process rather than protecting status.

Humanism should not make leadership sentimental. Some decisions will disappoint, roles will change and standards must be enforced. The framework asks that truth be spoken without humiliation, that burdens be justified and fairly distributed, and that people retain as much voice and agency as circumstances allow. Courage is part of Attitude; conscience is part of Soul; difficult execution is part of Action.

The framework is also personal without becoming individualistic. Leaders need reflective practices that help them notice fear, ego and moral fatigue, but organizations must redesign incentives and governance so that humane behavior is not punished. The aim is not to find heroic leaders who resist every system. It is to build systems in which ordinary leaders can repeatedly make more intelligent, dignified and responsible choices.

23. Final Integrative Discussion

The 4A Framework presents leadership as an integrated human act. Leaders must know, relate, discern and do. Learning without humility becomes expertise used as domination. Attitude without courage becomes politeness that avoids truth. Soul without evidence becomes self-righteousness. Action without conscience becomes efficient dehumanization. The model's power is therefore configurational: leadership quality depends on the presence and interaction of all four dimensions.

In AI-enabled organizations, this integration is urgent. Technology can amplify judgment, but it can also amplify indifference. Humanistic leadership does not romanticize the past or oppose innovation. It insists that innovation remain answerable to persons, communities and a future worth inhabiting. That is not a soft ambition. It is a demanding standard of competence, character and accountability.

References

- Avolio, B. J., & Gardner, W. L. (2005). Authentic leadership development. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 16(3), 315-338.
- Bachmann, C., Habisch, A., & Dierksmeier, C. (2018). Practical wisdom: Management's no longer forgotten virtue. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 153, 147-165.
- Banks, G. C., McCauley, K. D., Gardner, W. L., & Guler, C. E. (2016). A meta-analytic review of authentic and transformational leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 27(4), 634-652.
- Bass, B. M. (1985). *Leadership and performance beyond expectations*. Free Press.
- Bedi, A., Alpaslan, C. M., & Green, S. (2016). A meta-analytic review of ethical leadership outcomes and moderators. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 139, 517-536.
- Brown, M. E., Treviño, L. K., & Harrison, D. A. (2005). Ethical leadership. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 97(2), 117-134.
- Ciulla, J. B. (1998). *Ethics, the heart of leadership*. Praeger.
- Dierksmeier, C. (2016). *Qualitative freedom: Autonomy in cosmopolitan responsibility*. Springer.

- Edmondson, A. C. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 44(2), 350-383.
- Edmondson, A. C., & Lei, Z. (2014). Psychological safety. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 1, 23-43.
- Eva, N., Robin, M., Sendjaya, S., van Dierendonck, D., & Liden, R. C. (2019). Servant leadership: A systematic review. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 30(1), 111-132.
- Freeman, R. E. (1984). *Strategic management: A stakeholder approach*. Pitman.
- Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant leadership*. Paulist Press.
- Heifetz, R. A. (1994). *Leadership without easy answers*. Harvard University Press.
- Kellogg, K. C., Valentine, M. A., & Christin, A. (2020). Algorithms at work. *Academy of Management Annals*, 14(1), 366-410.
- Maak, T., & Pless, N. M. (2006). Responsible leadership in a stakeholder society. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 66, 99-115.
- Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H., & Schoorman, F. D. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. *Academy of Management Review*, 20(3), 709-734.
- Melé, D. (2003). The challenge of humanistic management. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 44, 77-88.
- Melé, D. (2010). Practical wisdom in managerial decision making. *Journal of Management Development*, 29(7/8), 637-645.
- Mittelstadt, B. D., Allo, P., Taddeo, M., Wachter, S., & Floridi, L. (2016). The ethics of algorithms. *Big Data & Society*, 3(2), 1-21.
- Pirson, M. (2017). *Humanistic management*. Cambridge University Press.
- Raisch, S., & Krakowski, S. (2021). Artificial intelligence and management: The automation-augmentation paradox. *Academy of Management Review*, 46(1), 192-210.
- Rosso, B. D., Dekas, K. H., & Wrzesniewski, A. (2010). On the meaning of work. *Research in Organizational Behavior*, 30, 91-127.
- Schwartz, B., & Sharpe, K. E. (2010). *Practical wisdom*. Riverhead Books.
- Sendjaya, S., Sarros, J. C., & Santora, J. C. (2008). Defining and measuring servant leadership behaviour. *Journal of Management Studies*, 45(2), 402-424.
- Treviño, L. K., Hartman, L. P., & Brown, M. (2000). Moral person and moral manager. *California Management Review*, 42(4), 128-142.
- van Dierendonck, D. (2011). Servant leadership: A review and synthesis. *Journal of Management*, 37(4), 1228-1261.
- Werhane, P. H. (1999). *Moral imagination and management decision-making*. Oxford University Press.
- World Health Organization. (2021). *Ethics and governance of artificial intelligence for health*. World Health Organization.
- Yukl, G. (2013). *Leadership in organizations* (8th ed.). Pearson.
- Zuboff, S. (2019). *The age of surveillance capitalism*. PublicAffairs.

How do I cite this article?

Dr. Ignacio Bonasa et.al, Humanistic Leadership in AI-Enabled Organizations The 4A Framework of Learning, Attitude, Soul and Action for Responsible Performance, *Excel International Journal of Technology, Engineering and Management*, 2026; Volume -13, Issue-3_Page_38-50.

DOI Link: <https://doi.org/10.64971/j.cph.ejtem.v13.i3.5.2026>



This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license
(<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>)