

July 2022

Ethical Pluralism: The Decision-Making System of a Complex World

Clinton P. Unger
University of Charleston, West Virginia, clintonunger@ucwv.edu

Follow this and additional works at: <https://scholar.valpo.edu/jvbl>



Part of the [Leadership Studies Commons](#)

Recommended Citation

Unger, Clinton P. (2022) "Ethical Pluralism: The Decision-Making System of a Complex World," *The Journal of Values-Based Leadership*: Vol. 15 : Iss. 2 , Article 15.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.22543/1948-0733.1410>

Available at: <https://scholar.valpo.edu/jvbl/vol15/iss2/15>

This Peer-Reviewed Article is brought to you for free and open access by the College of Business at ValpoScholar. It has been accepted for inclusion in The Journal of Values-Based Leadership by an authorized administrator of ValpoScholar. For more information, please contact a ValpoScholar staff member at scholar@valpo.edu.

Ethical Pluralism:

The Decision-Making System of a Complex World



CLINTON UNGER
JOLON, CALIFORNIA, USA

Abstract

Today's leaders are faced with many different ethical decisions that are further highlighted by social media and a rapid news cycle. It has been established that there is no universal ethical code, nor is there one unified global culture. Leaders must continually educate themselves and their employees in proper leadership techniques, education, decision-making, and cultural understanding. Pluralism is engrained in ethics, where there are different interpretations of the same information, different ways to analyze the situation, and different ethical frameworks. While pluralism can lead to different outputs and decisions across the same situation, it is not a blight on ethics but a way to understand the reason for varying outcomes and feedback.

Introduction

Deeply affecting world economics, globalization is in many ways beneficial because it allows people from developing nations to sell their goods worldwide through markets like eBay, Amazon, or Alibaba. This opportunity allows them to acquire outside income and spurs development within whole communities. As developing nations cannot compete on the same scale as the superpowers, there will be missed opportunities. Opportunities and ethical views vary by personal background and all know what they view as ethical. Comparing these different ethical backgrounds is where we see many different pluralistic views of the same problem. Ethical pluralism is a way of life, has many different applications, and is suitable for leaders, governments, businesses, and cultures.

Pluralism Definition and Views

“Pluralism is about having multiple frames of analysis” (Wight, 2015). Multiple frames of analysis come from having different views and perspectives. This concept leads to ethical decision-making. Different opinions, using various frameworks for decision making, and achieving different outputs are different types of pluralism. “Ethical decisions should be guided by multiple standards” (Arnold et al., 2010) and reinforces the pluralistic point of view to confirm and vet that things are ethical. When individuals can compare these different opinions and confirm whether or not decisions comport among various peoples, ethical progress is invariably made. Through these tricky decisions and conversations, people can discover and reconcile their differences.

Wight (2015) expounded that horizontal pluralism provides more than one approach to a given set of problems in a singular ethical framework, where vertical pluralism uses more than one ethical framework to solve the problem. For example, the Golden Rule constitutes one ethical framework, and following the teachings of Confucius another. Several different frameworks combine opposing beliefs, often resulting in an ethical predicament. Complexities reinforce the pluralistic nature of decision-making when culture, religion, background, and social status are all involved. As people have different viewpoints, all these varieties lead to the complex inputs and outputs of decision-making.

Paradoxes and pluralistic have different meanings: a pluralistic decision may involve a paradox or be an inherent part of complex decision-making (Drumwright et al., 2015; Morrison & Lumby, 2009; Sotirova, 2018; Wight, 2015; Wilson, 2014). Moral goodness or ethical decisions are made by individual assessors and are pluralistic by nature (Chiu & Hackett, 2017; Wilson, 2014). Having pluralistic decisions is an inherent part of a complex environment. Such multi-faceted systems require creative solutions that meet the most significant needs but are not necessarily the most ethical from a holistic perspective (Murphy et al., 2017). Martineau et al. (2017) stated, "The more complex the system, the greater the variety must be in order to reach control of it." Everyone cannot be pleased with the most straightforward decisions, as we are all individuals and have different likes and dislikes. Even if an employer released people early with pay, some would grumble because there was still work to be done, while others might not want to go home, and still others might complain about the company's fiscal loss – or a combination of all scenarios. We are all individualistic by nature, and using complex systems is a fact of the world in which we live. These complex systems, mixed with ethical decision-making, are the lifeblood of leaders.

Ethical Leadership

Part of leadership is developing ethical decision-making across the workforce. Leaders should be held ethically accountable in their admission by the organization (Gabriele, 2012; Walumbwa et al., 2008; Wilson, 2004). Miller (2013) described leaders as constantly having to evaluate the benefit of their actions to others versus finding an answer to predict where short-term solutions and finger-pointing may cloud judgment. Fehr et al. (2105) also supported this and stated that the overall ethical shift has transitioned from a universal ethical view to an individual ethical leadership style. Weighing the different viewpoints and identifying an individual preference or bias is the challenge of ethical leadership development. Developing leaders and their decision-making prowess is an inherent and implied role of senior leaders. Instilling good ethical decision-making is a pivotal point for any leadership development program.

Leaders

Leaders carry different positions and are aligned with different perspectives; their backgrounds often direct them to embrace a particular bias (Morrison & Lumby, 2009). According to Morrison and Lumby, more often than not, organizational members and leaders' advisors tend to adopt their own leaders' stances. Stance adoption reinforces that more is caught than taught, as explained by Johnson (2018). If leaders have that effect on their followers for other acts, this can most certainly be true for shaping ethical behaviors. Senior leaders who can demonstrate the desired ethical tendencies and educate the workforce when not faced with an ethical dilemma pave the way for future development across their respective

organizations. Having a vision without demonstrating an ethical foundation will take an organization only so far. For example, company events can be an optimal occasion for senior leaders to demonstrate their moral attributions. A senior leader who cheats at a game to gain a personal advantage reinforces that violating expected rules of conduct might be acceptable when money, position, status, or even physical freedoms are at stake. Opponents will dismiss this situation as an ungrounded example, arguing general irrelevance or simply having a good time. It could be said that some cheating is allowed, or at least that there are grey areas within which one can operate. The issue with this type of justification is that it cannot be understood how followers, who view this behavior, will interpret it and whether or not they will draw the same ethical lines for what is deemed right or wrong. Ethical practices are not singular examples but a continuous process ingrained in daily activities – from reporting actual hours worked to accurately filing yearly tax returns.

Ethical leadership is a practice that should be taught continually and not just to meet a learning objective or a yearly mandate (Wilson, 2014). There should be a shift from a regular required training or education program to one where ethical training is in the forefront. Every aspect of business and organizational operations and practices must be imbued with ethical parameters.

Additionally, there should be some reinforcement and challenging discussions about issues that affect employees and peers. Understanding different opinions and the ethical dilemmas they face in a genuine and authentic atmosphere accomplish what Wilson (2014) concluded as a necessary development process. That is when there is conflict, there is an opportunity for others to discover their differences and talk about how they view the world. Through these ethical discussions, there can be opportunities to understand others' viewpoints. When someone defends or explains their point of view, they reflect and develop a deeper understanding of why they believe or feel that something is ethical or not ethical. Regardless of their stance, there should be continual effort to develop oneself and learn through self-analysis and feedback. Those who do not conduct an ethical self-assessment allow themselves to become blinded to outside viewpoints. Confiding in those with similar views reinforces and confirms their bias about how the world operates. Too much of the same perspective is like informational incest, and results in a loss of creativity and stifled output. It takes others, reflecting on their viewpoints, analyzing what others see in us, and vocalizing what is seen in others, that create authentic development.

Leaders should keep themselves and their organizations above reproach about character, ethical, and integrity issues and away from conflict-of-interest situations where money and funding are concerned (Gabriele, 2012). There are many situations where money is quickly an influencer when ethics are called into question. While there may not be an actual influence, the outside perception of influence can be as damaging. Regardless of the reason, ethics should always be a constant developmental tool for leaders and be incorporated into decision-making.

Decision-Making

Incorporating ethics into everyday practices such as decision-making is difficult but not impossible. Most leaders already have some form of framework or process for how they make decisions. Fehr et al. (2015) claimed that leaders base their decisions on ethical or moral frameworks. However, cultural pluralism exists when there are differences of opinions,

lifestyles, or desires. An example used was Chick-fil-A and how taking a public stance against same-sex marriage as consistent with one ethical principle, but others view it as violating fairness and employee welfare resulting in loss of customer patronage and opposition mobilization. Governments have an incredibly challenging job in defining ethical and unethical actions as some decisions affect individual choice. Machiavelli encouraged evil actions and excused the intrinsic immorality of political actions justifying the means by the morality of their effects. The focus needs to remain with the general good as human nature and variety will nearly always have infinite possibilities.

Murphy et al. (2017) highlighted that the nonlinear dynamics of leadership lead to various outcomes and that being creative is part of being a leader. Chiu and Hackett (2017) claimed that some do not even see the pluralistic nature of a decision but only see the individual's viewpoint charged with the decision. They additionally concluded that the organization's responsibility is to instill the desired ethics and education to define correct or incorrect behaviors for their employees. Opponents say that individual businesses cannot effectively teach diversity and cultural background as they cannot be all-knowing. The solution is for expanded business education, supported by external reinforcement and discovery, to discern and understand various views. Those who oppose decision-making freedom and creativity advocate for a specific framework while limiting ethical discussions, forcing the process to follow a prescribed personnel route, and restricting additional influence. A specific framework may increase the system's speed and efficiency and limit the understanding of outside impacts. For example, a grocery store that decides to use only reusable bags to save the environment through a company's internal framework may yield that switching to reusable bags saves costs and saves landfill space. However, not consulting outside entities delimits the knowledge available to finalize a policy or practice. For example, the CDC may interject that customers' reusable bags help contribute to the spread of the coronavirus. An economist may determine that several jobs are lost, and supply chain management is disrupted by no longer purchasing disposable bags. An environmental engineer may determine that reusable bags may take more carbon and energy than traditional bags. Not consulting outside entities and using a strict, prescribed framework leads to decision-making myopia, overlooking exterior perspectives. One historical area for lacking a holistic understanding is decision-making that affect whole societies. These are difficult because there are many different views and consultants to both identify and understand unforeseen circumstances.

Washington and Henfield (2019) discussed how social justice advocacy and the counseling profession could represent and tease out a person's personal feelings to help with recovery when ethical standards have turned away and fall into an ethical grey area. When governments make decisions based on a bias, they do not take all the variables into account or make incorrect assumptions, leading to population exclusion or corruption. In the Black Lives Matter (BLM) movement, ignoring or disregarding peoples' experiences and hardships based on their position in society has only given fuel to government abandonment adding to neglect. Such inaction further fuels the participant's desire, motivation, and perseverance to continue to protest and long for a representative voice and ethical treatment (Washington & Henfield, 2019). This exclusion has become the war cry for those excluded, abused, omitted, and those who observe or know someone affected by these acts or continued processes of inaction and inertia. Johnson (2018) described the ethical shadows and how leaders can fall into these shadows through miscommunication or exclusion.

An example is the BLM movement. Opponents of the BLM movement state that participants are just thugs, villains, Marxists, or undereducated. This recalcitrance and inability to gauge the reasons for the movement has turned BLM into a brand and a mantra. Not addressing the issue of inclusion only gives BLM more power. Social media voices are nearly equal and uncensored. Policymakers need to address the exclusion and weigh the cost to the rest of society to ensure no group is excluded or discriminated against. It is a very different time to be in government or politics.

Government Ethics

Governmental leaders have to weigh the benefits for a whole society while appeasing those who voted them into office. Leading is not a task for the weary. There is a struggle between managing leaders to providing executive leadership (Murphy et al., 2017). This struggle manifests itself where it may be easier to manage the daily operations versus where the need for government and other public administrators. This complex environment can be teased out in nearly every corner where full-time administrators commonly run the institution rather than guide the institution's output. A variety of political systems compounds this complexity. Enderich and Trapp (2020) explained that an ethical system must be integrated into the organizational climate and be self-motivating. Kasiński (2018) expressed concern for a governmental system that was naturally pluralistic due to party affiliation or group-based decision-making. Self-governing usually leads to corruption and creates momentum for one particular group or interest. Tailoring legislation, execution, or judicial decisions to a particular group or interest is dangerous and may have dire consequences.

This democratic idea that everyone is created equal is not universally true. This only works in societies and representative governments when everyone has the same access to voting and political representation greater than once every four years. Moore (1996) expressed that democracy is inherently individualistic as people vote for their interests and those in the majority bear the fruits of majority rule. Leaders should make a genuine effort to understand the impact and repercussions of their decisions and legislations. Conversely, those who are not continually active in politics providing feedback might not help them understand upcoming decisions and how they will be impacted. However, because someone is not involved does not mean that they should be excluded or judged. Those in power should still represent all in their district and still be good stewards of the Constitution.

Contrary to the inclusion perspective, where all are considered, are discussions about how the current systems do not placate all. Trying to envision or establish an all-inclusive beneficial system is not always possible; it is fallacy of misplaced concreteness to blame the system and not the individuals making the decisions. Leaders are elected or appointed to represent everyone in their districts, towns, states, or regions. Those who cannot perform up to this standard jeopardize the entire system. Those who perform unethically and pursue democratic ventures undermine the system and demonstrate a clash of plural values (Nick, 2019). Simultaneously, a representative government and a corrupt one cannot exist. There will always be a conflict of interest, a lack of priorities, personal agendas, or trying to please too many opposing views.

Kasiński (2018) stated that the way to effect meaningful societal reform is to reestablish its citizens' strengths, recognizing the formal government, and combining the natural rights of individual citizens. Obviously, exercising one's rights will affect others, sometimes positively

and other times negatively. For example, person A's right to drive a motor vehicle at 30 mph may impact someone else's right to drive at 25 mph, as that is where they feel comfortable. Now person A has to divert course, move around, or adjust their speed. Many other variables can come into play, but neither decision is morally incorrect or exact, assuming both are within the prescribed speed limit. There is the possibility of infringing on others as one has to change course and speed as the faster driver approaches the other from the rear. These are decisions that exist in a pluralistic society.

Nick (2019) explained that the need to perform unethical acts to remain democratic and protect the system is no longer required, contrary to Machiavelli's point of view. When ethical people start to perform unethically, there needs to be an analysis of the system to determine where corruption originates. Miller (2013) included several parables to describe how people mislead others based on morality or civility to gain personal position or benefit others based on the leader; regardless, these parables reduce the transmission of unethical values and immorality. Motivating possibilities might include the attainment of power, money, or status resulting from a lack of oversight or capability mismatch. No one is perfect and blameless all the time, but there should be a general effort to do what is right for most people and perform to a standard that should not bring shame, dishonor, or ill repute to the organization. Challengers state that since no one is perfect, there should be a broader viewpoint and tolerance band for those that do not perform ethically. Misunderstanding, a momentary lapse, peer pressure, or human nature can lead to unethical decisions. While this may be true for momentary decisions, leaders are held to a higher standard for the dictates of their office. No one is perfect, but some universal truths, for example, dehumanizing others and corruption, should not be tolerated in American society.

Nick (2019) also stated that those with "dirty hands" or unethical practices do not represent a democratic government and society; rather, they are rife with corruption or self-gain. Leaders who commit unethical and premeditated acts to get elected foreshadow how their official performance will be. We all have to perform as ethically as we can. Miller (2013) also described those corporate leaders and ordinary civilians share responsibility for the common good. We all hold a common position and can provide oversight where ethics are concerned. Opponents state that when everyone is responsible, no one is. This is true, to a point. Everyone has the responsibility to state whether something viewed is unethical in their own eyes for the betterment of all. Those who observe unethical acts and do nothing are just as guilty by omission. For example, those who witness a murder and do not report the crime can be charged for not reporting or stopping the crime itself. Simply saying nothing is an option, but the unethical acts continue. It takes stepping up and stating that something is not correct to make the actor engage in self-analysis and have the opportunity to alter their actions. The same is especially true for businesses with production or sales goals.

Business Ethics

Business leaders set the standard for their companies and the ethical principles that the organization holds. There are different ethical levels to which businesses aspire and ultimately choose to adopt, yet none are equal. Drumwright et al. (2015) concluded that business ethics are not taught universally, and that new practitioners are not adequately equipped to handle all ethical challenges. Unequal education should not be confused with cultural pluralism as a practice but does explain how some arrive at different conclusions. Not understanding the ethical impacts due to ignorance is different from understanding the impacts due to poor

choices. This ethical uncertainty trickles through all levels of organizations. The most common or lowest level of ethics has been referred to as ethical functioning (Moore, 1996). Looking at and examining this lowest level is the best way to take an organization's ethical temperature. One could inquire about the character of the senior managers, but enforcing the company's culture and how all the employees are operating is different. Wells Fargo and its account scandal is an excellent example of how the best intentions can backfire when devoid of ethic parameters established by the company. The institutionalization of an ethical atmosphere within a company is a genuinely collaborative effort for all across an organization.

Moore (1996) explained that collaborative leadership helps drive and reinforce the concerns that are not experienced equally. Disability discrimination is one example. If it were not for disabled people speaking up and being heard about how they do not have equal access to some buildings without wheelchair ramps, the issue would not have been elevated to become law. The right to decide not to put in a wheelchair ramp is different from someone who did not think people would need one. This example boils down to individual decisions, but the leader's personal qualities and characteristics can carry just as much weight for good or bad. Sotirova (2018) concluded that the leader's personal qualities could be rearranged and changed over time to become more or less ethically based on the decisional understanding and the feedback received. These good or bad qualities are derived and honed through constant interactions, discussions from peer interactions, leadership development programs, and other methods of self-discovery. All people are affected by the world around them, and those who strive for continuous improvement usually find it.

Internalizing negativity and looking for ways to get ahead by any means necessary is contrary to self-improvement. Bypassing a system to get ahead is ethical self-sabotage. Opponents believe that sufficient systems have protections or safeguards in place to prevent unethical usurpations. This pluralistic view is possible, but there are many possible outcomes that no system can function if it restricts every possible wrongdoing. Most leaders generally strive for good through these pluralistic decisions and environments.

One aspect of a thriving, ethical environment is the generation and analysis of feedback. Kasiński (2018) concluded that an effective feedback system usually produces desired results for a pluralistic system. Moore (1996) has a similar saying that feedback refines the leaders' perspectives and reduces future unnecessary pluralism. Feedback is a gift and a way to influence critical decisions (Badaracco, 2013). Understanding the effects of decisions, their impact, and the nature of the established systems allow comprehension and competence improvement. Working with outside entities, feedback can be tailored to help define and guide organizational goals and understand whether an ethical conflict exists. Many companies do this for environmental reasons to understand if they are truly carbon zero or negative. Not every company can honestly say this, but it is something that some companies strive to achieve. Regardless, the feedback is the check to see if the system is working. There is an added level of complexity in pluralism, but that does not mean that it is any less ethical. Some would argue that by having more input and insight, organizations have a possibility to create more ethical structures. Increased organizational aperture is beneficial, but the opposite can be true if too many people in positions of influence spoil the process and sway people towards pursuing self-interest. The most influential person does not mean that he or she is the most correct or ethical. These types of situations can generate tension, and that can be too much for some individuals.

Recognizing tensions and the variety of possible outcomes from those decisions can be overwhelming (Cunha et al., 2019). Knowing that decisions impact others is part of the situation, but eventually managers need to manage and leaders need to lead. Too much analysis can backfire especially when the business must meet required outputs. Whether it be a specific product, service output, or a governing facility, there is still a requirement for action and the avoidance of inaction. Staying in the analysis phase for too long does not produce an output. Making decisions with pluralistic outcomes is part of leadership and understanding the possible impacts inherent to the position. VanderPal and Ko (2014) defended that business ethics are common practice and maintained that ethics and moral conscience are something one practices instead of what one has. Ethics as an ordinary action reinforces ethical pluralism as it is not an inherent and constant influencer. Viewing ethics as actions and not as a personal attribute provides an excuse and a reason for why there may be a lapse of judgment. These personal ethical codes are also tied to individual beliefs and views that accompany their culture.

Culture and Ethics

Everyone has a culture, whether they claim one or not. This culture has some inherent attributes and gives us all a sense of individuality that affects how we integrate into society. Yang et al. (2017) divided ethical choices into either a group choice, how the decision affects the group as a whole, an individual choice, or how it will affect the individual. Wight (2015) contended that nearly every decision starts with how it will affect others and then eventually focuses on how it will affect oneself. The example used is the Golden Rule and treating others as how one desires to be treated. Morrison and Lumby (2009) reminded us that leaders are individuals to a point; they fall in a broader context of social, political, and cultural context and norms. They may fall in line with those contexts entirely or stay committed to their personal beliefs of what is acceptable or what they simply believe is necessary. The difference between what is acceptable and what needs to be done is where the most significant changes are observed. Leaders who step out believe there is an injustice or that something warrants investigation can cause wide-sweeping changes for the better – equal voting, for example. However, leaders who venture outside of established parameters and take advantage or who look for personal gain can cause some of the most extraordinary turmoil – Enron, for example. While neither example is flawless and holistic, they illustrate how individuals are able to control a portion of how they are observed and hence, perform within their perceived ethical boundaries. All of these ethical boundaries shape our daily interactions as well as our discourse.

Conversations should emanate from those from different backgrounds to understand cross-cultural understanding, deepen authentic leadership, and broaden leadership development through interdisciplinary means (Wilson, 2014). VanderPal and Ko (2014) offered that understanding other cultures and educational processes provides opportunities to understand different other viewpoints and the impact of our decisions. Understanding other perspectives and how different cultures view and understand the world around them lead to how some arrive at varied conclusions for the same ethically-based challenge. Being aware through training and education allows greater ethical awareness and refinement. Additionally, cross-cultural theory and human resources management training may lead to understanding others and the possible impact, therefore creating ethical precision, reducing the possible number of outputs (Cunha et al., 2019). Decreasing outputs shows that there can be a broader

solution, but education is invariably the key to this process. Self-development is available through conversation, organizational plans, execution practices, and formal education.

Not all leaders have the benefit of formal education and must rely upon experience. Experience should not be discounted because it has worked, but just because it has worked once does not mean that it will always work. Even a broken clock is right twice a day. Plus, those who only focus on their past and what they have done do not look forward to the future and eventually stagnate or if you don't know where you're going, any road will take you there. Leaders who have continuously sought improvement and refined themselves over time have learned from their experiences, including their mistakes, and improved others.

Drumwright et al. (2015) discovered “embracing the tenets of liberal learning that include critical thinking, multiple framing, practical reasoning, and reflection, educators can meaningfully improve current approaches to ethics education in business schools.” Education and cultural understanding are ways to improve society and create holistic business approaches. Education does not have to be formal but can also come through exploration and learning about other cultures. Sotirova (2018) stressed that cross-cultural understanding is required to understand social learning theories and produce ethical leadership. For example, in a Chinese study, Yang et al. (2017) discovered that the group decision was not the most ethical, but it was the most moderate, or in other words, achieves the best results for the most people. This study was impactful because it describes how collectivist cultures group decision-making in selecting the choice that will achieve the most common good but may still harm many. A western view of this study may find it unethical, but it does the most good for the collective society. It is also interesting that there are additional research possibilities to see what the most ethical decision would have yielded had there been additional choices and decisions.

VanderPal and Ko (2014) concluded that conflict resolution and the conversations around those decisions end in issue resolution or provocation. Moving towards respect and tolerance through education and understanding, leads toward a genuine appreciation of others and different cultures, thereby understanding the possible outcomes of ethical pluralism. Critics of ethical pluralism state that there should not be a variety of outputs. Cultural context and desired outcomes do not make this possible. While others cannot always be considered, subsequent decisions should make an effort to not continually deprive or discount one specific group as that would lead to discrimination or exclusion. Always considering others could lead to indecision. Involving too many other people who may not have the same good-natured spirit, could derail or sidetrack the overall inclusion and consideration outcome.

Conclusion

Ethical pluralism is a way of life, has many different applications, and is suitable for leaders, governments, businesses, and cultures. Through education, leaders can mentally sharpen and improve their workforces to understand other cultures and make sound business decisions that will bring pride and positive reinforcement to their organizations. Pluralism and the feedback that it receives make it possible for leaders to grow and develop even more through the decision-making cycle. Leaders should continually reinforce ethical practices in their processes and organizations, and consider that different outcomes are also just as ethical.

References

- Arnold, D. G., Audi, R., & Zwolinski, M. (2010). Recent Work in Ethical Theory and Its Implications for Business Ethics. *Business Ethics Quarterly*, 20(4), 559–581. <https://doi.org/10.5840/beq201020438>
- Badaracco, Jr., J. L. (2013). *The Good Struggle: Responsible Leadership in an Unforgiving World*. Boston, Mass: Harvard Business Review Press.
- Chiu, R. B., & Hackett, R. D. (2017). The assessment of individual moral goodness. *Personal Relationships*, 26(1), 31–46. <https://doi.org/10.1111/beer.12137>
- Cunha, M. P. e, Fortes, A., Gomes, E., Rego, A., & Rodrigues, F. (2019). Ambidextrous leadership, paradox and contingency: evidence from Angola. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 30(4), 702–727. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2016.1201125>
- Drumwright, M., Prentice, R., & Biasucci, C. (2015). Behavioral Ethics and Teaching Ethical Decision Making. *Decision Sciences Journal of Innovative Education*, 13(3), 431–458. <https://doi.org/10.1111/dsji.12071>
- Enderich, C., & Trapp, R. (2020). Ethical Implications of Management Accounting and Control: A Systematic Review of the Contributions from the Journal of Business Ethics. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 163(2), 309.
- Fehr, R., Kai Chi (Sam) Yam, & Dang, C. (2015). Moralized Leadership: The Construction and Consequences of Ethical Leader Perceptions. *Academy of Management Review*, 40(2), 182–209. <https://doi.org/10.5465/amr.2013.0358>
- Gabriele, E. (2012). Stewarding the Human Good: Understanding the Nature of Research and Its Ethical Horizons. *Journal of Research Administration*, 43(1), 112–122.
- Grint, K. (2011). A History of Leadership. In A. Bryman, D. Collinson, K. Grint, B. Jackson, & M. Uhl-Bien (Eds.), *The Sage Handbook of Leadership*. London, England: Sage Publications Ltd.
- Johnson, C. E. (2018). *Meeting the ethical challenges of leadership: Casting light or shadow* (6th ed.) Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Kasiński, M. (2018). Ethical and political dilemmas of local self-government in Poland in the course of systemic transformations (1990–2018). *Annales. Etyka w Życiu Gospodarczym*, 21(7), 7–26. <https://doi.org/10.18778/1899-2226.21.7.01>
- Martineau, J., Johnson, K., & Pauchant, T. (2017). The Pluralist Theory of Ethics Programs Orientations and Ideologies: An Empirical Study Anchored in Requisite Variety. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 142(4), 791–815. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-016-3183-x>
- Miller, R. A. (2013). The Well-Being of a Corporation: Parables for a Legal Concept in Ethical Crisis. *Journal of Leadership, Accountability & Ethics*, 10(3), 127–134.–175.
- Moore, R. D. (March 1996). *Ethical Responsibilities for Leaders in a Pluralistic Society*. Conference paper presented at the Annual Five-State Multicultural Conference (Garden City, KS).

- Morrison, M., & Lumby, J. (2009). Is leadership observable? Qualitative orientations to leadership for diversity. A case from FE. *Ethnography & Education*, 4(1), 65–82. <https://doi.org/10.1080/17457820802703515>
- Murphy, J., Rhodes, M. L., Meek, J. W., & Denyer, D. (2017). Managing the Entanglement: Complexity Leadership in Public Sector Systems. *Public Administration Review*, 77(5), 692–704. <https://doi.org/10.1111/puar.12698>
- Nick, C. (2019). In Defence of Democratic Dirty Hands. *Theoria: A Journal of Social & Political Theory*, 66(160), 71–94.
- Sotirova, D. (2018). Ethical Leadership in Cross-Cultural Business Communication. *Acta Prosperitatis*, 9, 51–71.
- VanderPal, G., & Ko, V. S. C. (2014). An Overview of Global Leadership: Ethics, Values, Cultural Diversity and Conflicts. *Journal of Leadership, Accountability & Ethics*, 11(3), 166.
- Walumbwa, F., Avolio, B., Gardner, W., Wensing, T., & Peterson, S., (2008). Authentic Leadership: Development and Validation of a Theory-based Measure. *Journal of Management*, 34 (1), 89–126.
- Washington, A. R., & Henfield, M. S. (2019). What Do the AMCD Multicultural and Social Justice Counseling Competencies Mean in the Context of Black Lives Matter? *Journal of Multicultural Counseling & Development*, 47(3), 148–160. <https://doi.org/10.1002/jmcd.12138>
- Wight, J. B. (2015). Ethics in Economics: An Introduction to Moral Frameworks. *Stanford Economics and Finance*.
- Wilson, M. (2014). Critical reflection on authentic leadership and school leader development from a virtue ethical perspective. *Educational Review*, 66(4), 482–496. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00131911.2013.812062>
- Yang, J., Ji, H., & O’Leary, C. (2017). Group Ethical Decision-Making Process in Chinese Business: Analysis from Social Decision Scheme and Cultural Perspectives. *Ethics & Behavior*, 27(3), 201–220. <https://doi.org/10.1080/10508422.2016.1157690>
-

About the Author

Clinton Unger

Clinton Unger, MBA, is a Doctor of Executive Leadership student at the University of Charleston, West Virginia. He is a former Army instructor at Fort Bragg, North Carolina and is currently studying Feedback as a career development tool.

He can be reached at clintonunger@ucwv.edu.