

# Soulful Organizations: A Multidimensional Framework For Ethical And Sustainable Leadership In The 21<sup>st</sup> Century

Dr. Ignacio Bonasa Alzuria

President & Founder — Liderarte (Madrid, Spain)

ORCID: 0009-0001-3940-4278

Contact: [ibonasa@liderarte.org](mailto:ibonasa@liderarte.org)

Article Accepted 29<sup>th</sup> January 2026

Author(s) Retains the copyright of this article

## Abstract

*In a context marked by technological acceleration, pressure for immediate results, and the erosion of trust, many organizations have intensified their discourse on purpose, values, and wellbeing. However, a relevant gap persists between humanistic rhetoric and the day-to-day practice of leadership, governance, and culture. This paper proposes the theoretical construct “Soulful Organizations” as a humanistic paradigm applicable to management and leadership, defining “organizational soul” not as a religious concept, but as an observable cultural quality that integrates ethical coherence, collective human dignity, care, truth, a living purpose, and social responsibility. Through an integrative review of the literature on ethical and responsible leadership, organizational culture, meaningful work, psychological safety, wellbeing, and sustainability, a multidimensional framework with eight dimensions (EAO) is developed and influence mechanisms on key outcomes are described: wellbeing, engagement, trust, reputation, and sustainable performance. In addition, artificial intelligence (AI) is conceptualized as an amplifying factor, and human-centered AI governance is introduced as a critical condition to avoid dehumanization risks. The contribution is threefold: (i) an operational definition and boundaries of the construct, (ii) a conceptual model with testable propositions, and (iii) an empirical blueprint for validation (EAO scale development, psychometric strategies, multilevel longitudinal designs, and culture-intervention studies). Managerial implications are discussed for translating values into systems, incentives, and decisions.*

**Keywords:** soulful organizations; ethical leadership; organizational culture; dignity; purpose; workplace wellbeing; sustainability; psychological safety; emotional intelligence; spiritual intelligence; artificial intelligence; governance.

## Author's Note and Motivation for the Paradigm

This paper is born from a concrete managerial concern: in many organizations, the language of purpose, values, and wellbeing has grown faster than the practices that sustain it. I have observed—in top management and while accompanying leaders and teams—that the dilemmas that erode culture are rarely “big speeches”; they are everyday decisions under pressure (priorities, incentives, treatment of mistakes, what is measured, what is automated, how an exit is communicated, how listening happens). The construct of “organizational soul” seeks to name, with operational precision, that difference: when an organization preserves dignity, coherence, and care as management criteria, especially when it would be easier to give them up. The purpose of this piece is twofold: to provide a defensible theoretical framework in management/leadership and to propose an empirical roadmap that makes it possible to validate or refute the paradigm with replicable evidence.

## 1. Introduction

21st-century organizations operate under simultaneous tensions: global competitiveness, accelerated changes in business models, digital

transformation, social polarization, and rising expectations of transparency and responsibility. In parallel, mental health, engagement, and trust have become strategic variables — not only human ones —

due to their direct impact on sustainable productivity, innovation, service quality, and reputation.

In this context, narratives about purpose, culture, and values proliferate. However, a significant portion of those narratives fails to translate into consistent practices: contradictory decisions, cultures of chronic pressure, perceived inequity, or incentive systems that reward short-term results at the cost of wear and cynicism. This gap generates a central management problem: how to sustain results without sacrificing dignity, meaning, and humanity?

This paper argues that such a gap requires an integrative framework that unites ethics, culture, wellbeing, and sustainability into a single managerial theoretical construct. We propose the construct of “Soulful Organizations” as a humanistic paradigm applicable to management and leadership. The term “soul” is used in a non-religious way: it refers to an observable cultural quality that emerges when the organization preserves collective human dignity and ethical coherence as operational criteria for success. The academic ambition is twofold: (a) to build theory (conceptual paper) and (b) to facilitate future research through an empirical blueprint (scale, hypotheses, designs).

Relevance for management: in volatile markets, sustainable competitive advantage increasingly depends on intangible variables (trust, reputation, attraction and retention of talent, learning capacity). The EAO framework offers a structured way to govern those intangibles without giving up results discipline. One point should be emphasized: speaking of “soul” does not imply denying tension, conflict, or high standards. In fact, the theoretical construct only makes sense if it is tested precisely where culture “breaks”: in trade-offs, crises, mistakes, cuts, automation, and value conflicts. Therefore, the framework proposes observable indicators and an empirical validation agenda; without measurement and contrast, the term risks remaining a metaphor.

## **2. Academic Gap and Justification of the Theoretical Construct**

The management literature offers solid frameworks to address pieces of the puzzle: ethical leadership, authentic leadership and servant leadership; organizational culture and climate; meaningful work; psychological safety; wellbeing; and

sustainability/stakeholders. However, recurrent limitations exist:

- Conceptual fragmentation: models often operate in silos (ethics vs. wellbeing vs. sustainability) and are only partially integrated.
- Incomplete operationalization: purpose and values are often measured as general perceptions, without connecting them to decisions, systems, and incentives.
- Lack of cultural criteria under pressure: many frameworks describe “best practices” in stable contexts, but do not make explicit what happens in crises, dilemmas, or tensions.
- New sociotechnical risks: integrating AI and automation introduces governance, justice, and dehumanization challenges that are still insufficiently integrated into cultural models.

The theoretical construct “organizational soul” responds to this gap by proposing an integrating core: ethical coherence + dignity + care + truth + purpose + social responsibility, expressed in observable practices. The construct enables (i) articulating a multidimensional model, (ii) deriving testable propositions, and (iii) guiding cultural interventions.

### **2.1. Positioning Against Nearby Constructs**

To strengthen the paradigm’s discriminant validity, it is useful to position “organizational soul” relative to nearby constructs. Unlike “ethical climate” (centered on perceptions of ethical norms and practices), the EAO construct integrates, in addition, living purpose, dignity, and care as cross-cutting cultural criteria. Compared with “authentic leadership” or “servant leadership,” EAO does not describe only a leadership style, but a complete organizational system (governance, incentives, practices, and cultural rituals). It also differs from “organizational wellbeing” understood as programs or policies, because it demands coherence in difficult decisions and under pressure. This positioning enables hypothesis building and measurement with less overlap and greater theoretical clarity.

### **2.2. Three Micro-Vignettes of Decisions Under Pressure**

Vignette 1 — Restructuring and dignity: in a workforce reduction, two organizations take the same financial path, but with opposite cultures. In the first, communication is late, ambiguous, and defensive; the emotional cost is externalized and humiliation is “normalized” (rumors, leaks, depersonalized phrases).

In the second, criteria are made explicit, responsibility is assumed, real transitions are offered (guidance, support, and time), and dignity is protected even for those who leave. Both reduce costs; only one preserves trust and legitimacy.

Vignette 2 — Error and learning: a critical incident occurs due to a combination of haste and poor coordination. In fear-based cultures, the typical reaction is to search for culprits and “set an example,” which reduces truth and increases concealment. In cultures with organizational soul, the system is investigated (work design, pressure, resources, incentives), responsibility is distinguished from blame, and the error is turned into public learning, preserving respect.

Vignette 3 — AI and evaluation: an algorithmic system is introduced to evaluate performance and productivity. Without governance, the system becomes opaque, incentivizes defensive behaviors, and penalizes contexts that are not measured; the organization delegates moral judgment and a feeling of being “measured by a machine” sets in. With human-centered governance, limits are made explicit (which decisions are not automated), explanations, appeal, and human oversight are guaranteed, and AI is used to improve fairness and development—not to depersonalize.

### **3. Integrative Literature Review (Synthesis)**

This review is integrative: it does not seek to exhaust every stream, but to articulate a theoretical bridge between leadership, culture, wellbeing, and sustainability, incorporating the sociotechnical challenge of AI.

#### **3.1. Ethical, Responsible Leadership and Authenticity**

Research on ethical leadership suggests robust associations with trust, perceived justice, and prosocial behaviors (e.g., Brown & Treviño, 2006). In parallel, authentic leadership emphasizes inner coherence and relational transparency, and servant leadership highlights other-orientation, humility, and responsibility. These streams provide key pieces, but they tend to focus on the leader more than on the cultural and systemic architecture.

#### **3.2. Organizational Culture, Climate, and Psychological Safety**

Culture shapes implicit norms and real priorities. Psychological safety (Edmondson, 1999) acts as a

condition for learning, honest communication, and innovation: when fear or excessive control exists, the organization loses adaptive capacity and relational quality deteriorates.

#### **3.3. Meaningful Work, Purpose, and Dignity**

Meaningful work is associated with motivation, commitment, and psychological health. From eudaimonic perspectives, purpose is not a slogan but a compass that guides trade-offs. Dignity at work — being treated as an end and not as a means — is a central ethical criterion and a cultural predictor of trust and belonging.

#### **3.4. Wellbeing, Engagement, and Burnout: Resources and Demands**

The Job Demands-Resources model (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007) explains how chronic demands (load, permanent urgency, ambiguity) and insufficient resources (support, autonomy, justice) lead to burnout, while adequate resources foster engagement. A consistent managerial framework must connect culture, incentives, and work design with sustainable wellbeing.

#### **3.5. Sustainability and Stakeholders**

Sustainability requires integrating economic performance with social and environmental impact. The stakeholder approach broadens the success criterion and reinforces the need for moral coherence and accountability, especially when tensions exist between objectives.

#### **3.6. AI, Automation, and Sociotechnical Governance**

AI introduces risks of opacity, bias, depersonalization, and undue delegation of judgment. The emerging literature on human-centered AI proposes principles of transparency, explainability, human oversight, fairness, and responsibility. In cultural terms, AI can amplify the best (learning, efficiency) or the worst (control, dehumanization) depending on governance and applied ethics.

### **4. Operational Definition and Boundaries of the Theoretical Construct**

We define organizational soul as an observable cultural quality that emerges when the organization integrates ethical coherence, collective human dignity, care, truth, living purpose, and social responsibility in how it decides, leads, and executes. It is observed in practices (not in slogans) and is sustained, especially, under pressure.

Boundaries (what it is NOT):

- It is not a religious or doctrinal proposal.
- It is not equivalent to “niceness,” nor does it eliminate performance demands.
- It is not an isolated wellbeing program; it implies systems, incentives, and governance.
- It is not “soft” culture; it includes hard criteria for ethical decision-making, accountability, and sustainability.

**Table 2. Conceptual differentiation: EAO vs. nearby constructs**

Construct	Unit	Core	What it explains well	What it does not fully cover
EAO (Organizational soul)	Cultural system	Ethical coherence + dignity + care + truth + purpose + responsibility	Decisions under pressure; governance, incentives, and integrated cultural practice	Requires psychometric validation; semantic risk if not operationalized
Ethical climate	Perception	Perceived ethical norms and practices	Justice, ethical behaviors, and trust	Less focus on purpose, dignity, and care as cross-cutting criteria
Authentic leadership	Style/relationship	Self-awareness and relational transparency	Trust and relational quality	Does not capture the architecture of systems and incentives
Servant leadership	Style/values	Other-orientation, humility, and service	Care and people development	Does not integrate sustainability/AI nor systemic decisions
Organizational purpose	Narrative/strategy	Meaning and direction	Motivation and alignment	Can remain discourse if not integrated into governance and trade-offs

Note: it is recommended to test this differentiation through discriminant validity and factorial invariance in future studies.

### 5. Multidimensional Framework: Eight Dimensions and Their Indicators

**Table 1. Proposed dimensions of Organizational Soul (EAO) and observable indicators**

Dimension	Operational definition	Observable indicators (examples)
D1 Living purpose and shared meaning	Purpose guides priorities, decisions, and resource allocation.	Explicit criteria in dilemmas; consistency between discourse and trade-offs; decisions aligned with impact.
D2 Ethical coherence and moral responsibility	Decisions consistent with ethical principles and accountability.	Ethical governance; zero tolerance for shortcuts; reporting and repair processes; transparency in difficult decisions.
D3 Collective human dignity	Preservation of dignity as a condition of organizational success.	Respectful management of errors and crises; fair practices; humane handling of restructurings; anti-humiliation policies.
D4 Cuidado, compasión y legitimación de la humanidad	Non-paternalistic care that acknowledges emotions and mental health.	Active listening; real support; reasonable workloads; mental

		health programs connected to decisions and systems.
D5 Relational quality and community (trust and belonging)	Trust, cooperation, and belonging as cultural capital.	Psychological safety; cross-functional collaboration; conflict management through dialogue; low toxic internal politics.
D6 Emotional culture and conscious leadership	Leadership that models states, regulates pressure, and humanizes.	Dignified feedback; regulation of urgency; coherence between demands and care; emotional/spiritual intelligence development.
D7 Transcendence, service, and social impact	Responsibility toward stakeholders and social contribution.	Impact goals; decisions with social perspective; ESG coherence; real commitment (not marketing).
D8 Aligned action and meaningful results	Disciplined execution with coherence and meaning.	Aligned systems and incentives; dual metrics (results + dignity/wellbeing); continuous learning.

Note: the dimensions are proposed for empirical validation. They may consolidate into higher-order factors after confirmatory factor analysis.

## 6.

### **AI as an Amplifying Factor: Humanization vs. Dehumanization**

We propose treating AI as a sociotechnical moderator. In efficiency-driven cultures without ethical governance, AI can amplify opacity, bias, and depersonalization (e.g., automated decisions without explanation, hyper-controlling metrics, decontextualized evaluation). In cultures with organizational soul, AI is integrated through human-centered AI principles: transparency, explainability, human oversight, fairness, and participation. Thus, AI can amplify learning, personalized development, and efficiency without eroding dignity.

This implies that the managerial question is not only “what to automate,” but “which decisions require moral judgment, compassion, and human context.”

### **7. Conceptual Model and Propositions**

Figure 1 (description). The model proposes that Organizational Soul (EAO) influences organizational outcomes through cultural mediators: trust and perceived justice; psychological safety; lived sense/purpose; and organizational resources (support, autonomy, leadership quality).

Outcomes: wellbeing and mental health (lower burnout); engagement and commitment (lower turnover intention); relational quality and collaboration; reputation and social legitimacy; and sustainable performance (sustainable productivity, innovation, quality).

Key moderator: AI governance (human-centered vs. efficiency-only).

Note: the model posits cultural mediations and moderation by AI governance. Empirical validation can be carried out using SEM and multilevel models. Propositions/Hypotheses (empirical testing agenda):

- H1: EAO is positively associated with trust and perceived justice.
- H2: EAO is positively associated with psychological safety.
- H3: EAO is positively associated with wellbeing and engagement, and negatively with burnout.
- H4: The effects of EAO on sustainable performance are mediated by trust, psychological safety, and organizational resources.
- H5: Human-centered AI governance strengthens the relationship between EAO and outcomes; efficiency-only governance weakens it.
- H6: Cultural interventions based on experiential learning and conscious leadership increase EAO (pre-post design).

### **8. Empirical Blueprint: How to Validate the Paradigm (Track 3)**

#### **8.1 Development of the Organizational Soul Scale (EAO)**

- Step 1: Item generation (qualitative). Interviews with leaders and contributors ( $n \approx 30-60$ ) to extract language and examples by dimension.
- Step 2: Content validity. Expert panel (academics and practitioners) to refine items (clarity, relevance, redundancy).

- Step 3: Psychometric pilot. Initial sample ( $n \approx 200-400$ ) for exploratory factor analysis (EFA) and refinement.
- Step 4: Confirmation. Independent sample ( $n \approx 400-800$ ) for CFA/SEM, reliability ( $\alpha/\omega$ ), and convergent/discriminant validity.

### **8.2 Recommended criterion measures (examples)**

- Wellbeing (e.g., PERMA or eudaimonic measures).
- Engagement (e.g., UWES).
- Burnout (e.g., MBI or others).
- Psychological safety (validated scales).
- Organizational justice and trust.
- Organizational outcomes: turnover, absenteeism, eNPS, incidents, quality, sustainable productivity.

### **8.3 Recommended designs**

- Multilevel: employees nested in teams/units (HLM or multilevel SEM) to distinguish climate/culture from individual perceptions.
- Longitudinal: T1—T2—T3 measurements for temporal inference.
- Quasi-experimental: cultural intervention (experiential learning + conscious leadership + AI governance) with control group if possible.

### **8.4 Analyses**

- SEM to test mediations (trust, psychological safety, resources).
- Moderation for AI governance.
- Factorial invariance by country/sector for robustness.

**8.5 Initial item bank (examples) for the EAO Scale**

As an example (Likert 1—7: strongly disagree / strongly agree), initial items are proposed by dimension. These items must go through content refinement and psychometric testing.

- D1 Living purpose: “In this organization, purpose guides important decisions even when it involves short-term sacrifices.”
- D2 Ethical coherence: “When a dilemma arises, what is right is prioritized here even if it is the hardest option.”
- D3 Dignity: “In situations of error or underperformance, people are treated with respect and without humiliation.”
- D4 Care: “The organization takes real measures to protect mental health and workload, not just messages.”
- D5 Community: “There is a climate of trust that makes it easier to tell the truth without fear.”
- D6 Conscious leadership: “Leaders regulate pressure and urgency in a way that does not erode people.”
- D7 Transcendence: “The social impact of relevant decisions is assessed in addition to the economic impact.”
- D8 Aligned action: “Incentive and evaluation systems are aligned with the values that are declared.”

### **9. Managerial Implications (Track A)**

For management, the framework suggests that “soul” must be translated into decisions and systems:

1. Ethical governance: explicit criteria for dilemmas, transparency, and accountability.
2. Dual metrics: results + indicators of dignity/wellbeing/relationships.
3. Incentive design: align bonuses and evaluation with cultural coherence.
4. Conscious leadership: develop emotional competencies and the ability to sustain pressure without dehumanizing.
5. AI governance: human oversight, explainability, and algorithmic fairness.
6. Culture rituals: honest conversation, learning from mistakes, spaces for meaning.

The managerial thesis is clear: sustainable productivity is not achieved “despite” humanity, but “through” it.

### **Executive checklist (summary)**

- What do we sacrifice first under pressure: truth, dignity, care, or purpose?
- Do incentives reward cultural coherence or only short-term results?
- Is there psychological safety to tell the truth and learn from error?
- Is AI governed with explainability, human oversight, and the right to appeal?
- Are difficult decisions communicated with responsibility and respect?
- Do we measure sustainable performance (including cultural health) in addition to financial metrics?

### **10. Academic Contribution, Limits, and Future Lines**

Contributions: (i) a new integrative framework, (ii) a multidimensional framework with observable indicators, (iii) a model with relevant mediators/moderators, and (iv) an empirical blueprint to validate and replicate.

Limits: (a) possible semantic ambiguity of the term “soul” if not operationalized; (b) need for cross-cultural testing; (c) risk of collinearity with nearby constructs (ethical climate, authentic leadership). These limits are addressed through rigorous measurement, discriminant validity, and invariance.

Future lines: psychometric validation of EAO; multilevel longitudinal studies; evaluation of cultural interventions; and specific analysis of AI governance as a humanization lever.

### **References**

7. Avolio, B. J., & Gardner, W. L. (2005). Authentic leadership development: Getting to the root of

positive forms of leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*.

8. Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The Job Demands—Resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*.
9. Brown, M. E., & Treviño, L. K. (2006). Ethical leadership: A review and future directions. *The Leadership Quarterly*.
10. Brynjolfsson, E., & McAfee, A. (2014). *The second machine age*. W. W. Norton.
11. Cummings, T. G., & Worley, C. G. (2014). *Organization development and change* (10th ed.). Cengage.
12. Davis, K. (1960). Can business afford to ignore social responsibilities? *California Management Review*.
13. Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The “what” and “why” of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*.
14. Edmondson, A. (1999). Psychological safety and learning behavior in work teams. *Administrative Science Quarterly*.
15. Edmondson, A. C. (2018). *The fearless organization: Creating psychological safety in the workplace for learning, innovation, and growth*. Wiley.
16. Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organizational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*.
17. European Parliament & Council. (2016). General Data Protection Regulation (GDPR). *Official Journal of the European Union*.
18. Fiske, S. T. (2009). From dehumanization and objectification to rehumanization. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*.
19. Floridi, L. (2019). Establishing the rules for building trustworthy AI. *Nature Machine Intelligence*.
20. Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence*. Bantam.
21. Greenleaf, R. K. (1977). *Servant leadership*. Paulist Press.
22. Henderson, R. (2020). *Reimagining capitalism in a world on fire*. PublicAffairs.
23. High-Level Expert Group on AI. (2019). *Ethics guidelines for trustworthy AI*. European Commission.
24. Hollensbe, E., Wookey, C., Hickey, L., George, G., & Nichols, C. V. (2014). Organizations with purpose. *Academy of Management Journal*.
25. Iansiti, M., & Lakhani, K. R. (2020). *Competing in the age of AI*. Harvard Business Review Press.
26. Judge, T. A., & Piccolo, R. F. (2004). Transformational and transactional leadership: A meta-analytic test. *Journal of Applied Psychology*.
27. Kaptein, M. (2008). Developing and testing a measure for the ethical culture of organizations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*.
28. Kellerman, B. (2004). *Bad leadership*. Harvard Business School Press.
29. Keltner, D. (2016). *The power paradox*. Penguin.
30. Kouchaki, M., & Smith-Crowe, K. (2014). Ethical decision making: A review. *Organizational Psychology Review*.
31. Laloux, F. (2014). *Reinventing organizations*. Nelson Parker.
32. Lencioni, P. (2002). *The five dysfunctions of a team*. Jossey-Bass.
33. Maak, T., & Pless, N. M. (2006). Responsible leadership in a stakeholder society. *Journal of Business Ethics*.
34. Maslach, C., & Leiter, M. P. (2016). Understanding the burnout experience: Recent research and its implications. *World Psychiatry*.
35. Moore, C., & Gino, F. (2013). Ethically adrift: How others pull our moral compass. *Research in Organizational Behavior*.
36. Nussbaum, M. C. (2011). *Creating capabilities*. Harvard University Press.
37. Ouchi, W. G. (1979). A conceptual framework for the design of organizational control mechanisms. *Management Science*.
38. Pfeffer, J. (2018). *Dying for a paycheck*. HarperBusiness.
39. Rawls, J. (1971). *A theory of justice*. Harvard University Press.
40. Rogers, E. M. (2003). *Diffusion of innovations* (5th ed.). Free Press.
41. Rousseau, D. M. (1995). *Psychological contracts in organizations*. Sage.
42. Russell, S. (2019). *Human compatible: Artificial intelligence and the problem of control*. Viking.
43. Schein, E. H. (2010). *Organizational culture and leadership* (4th ed.). Jossey-Bass.

44. Seligman, M. E. P. (2011). *Flourish*. Free Press.
45. Shaw, J. D., Delery, J. E., Jenkins, G. D., & Gupta, N. (1998). An organization-level analysis of voluntary and involuntary turnover. *Academy of Management Journal*.
46. Snow, C. C., & Hambrick, D. C. (1980). Measuring organizational strategies. *Academy of Management Review*.
47. Sutton, R. I. (2007). *The no asshole rule*. Warner Business Books.
48. Tetlock, P. E. (2005). *Expert political judgment*. Princeton University Press.
49. Turkle, S. (2011). *Alone together*. Basic Books.
50. Tversky, A., & Kahneman, D. (1974). Judgment under uncertainty: Heuristics and biases. *Science*.
51. Waldman, D. A., & Galvin, B. M. (2008). Alternative perspectives of responsible leadership. *Organizational Dynamics*.
52. Walumbwa, F. O., Avolio, B. J., Gardner, W. L., Wernsing, T. S., & Peterson, S. J. (2008). Authentic leadership: Development and validation. *Journal of Management*.
53. Weaver, G. R., Treviño, L. K., & Cochran, P. L. (1999). Integrated and decoupled corporate social performance. *Academy of Management Journal*.
54. Whetten, D. A. (1989). What constitutes a theoretical contribution? *Academy of Management Review*.
55. Winfield, A. F. T., & Jirotka, M. (2018). Ethical governance is essential to building trust in robotics and AI systems. *Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society A*.
56. Zuboff, S. (2019). The age of surveillance capitalism. *PublicAffairs*.
57. Zweig, D. (2015). Invisibles: The power of anonymous work in an age of relentless self-promotion. *Portfolio*.

### **About the Author**

Dr. Ignacio Bonasa Alzuria is a Spanish reference figure in human development and organizational culture, and Executive President and founder of Liderarte (Madrid, Spain). He is also President of the European Association of Wellbeing, President of the European Association of Soulful Organizations, and President of the International Association “Dale la Vuelta a la Tortilla”, a global movement that

transforms pain into “vitamins for the soul” through ethical leadership, care, and collective responsibility.

With a prior career in top management and a sustained commitment to evidence-based practice, his work integrates Learning Through Art® and the 4A Model (Learning, Attitude, Soul, and Action). His current agenda connects relational health, moral influence, and institutional culture, promoting measurable approaches to care, dignity, and non-coercion across personal, educational, organizational, and social domains.

Academic education and honors (doctorates and postdoctorates):

- Doctor in Leadership and Organizational Transformation (PD) — European International University, Paris (2024).
- Doctor in Strategic Educational Administration (PhD) — Universidad Internacional Ignacio Castro Pérez, Mexico (2025).
- Doctor in Leadership (PhD) — IMU University, Cambodia (2026).
- Doctor in Soulful Leadership (PhD) — ASCEN University, Liberia (2026).
- Doctor in Business Administration (DBA) — Institute of Management and Technology (EIMT), Switzerland (June 2026).
- Honorary Doctorate — various doctoral bodies in Mexico (2025/2026).
- Honorary Doctorate — various international universities (2024/2025).
- Postdoctorate in Administrative Sciences and Senior Management through AI, in Philosophy and Multidisciplinary Scientific Research, and in Organizational and Workplace Wellbeing — Universidad Claustro Humanista and NELKUALI, Mexico (2025).
- Other additional doctoral and postdoctoral studies in leadership, psychology, education, and organizational transformation (2024-2026).

Author of *The Recipe for Well-Being*, he develops evidence-based programs that connect individual flourishing, relational health, and institutional responsibility. ORCID: 0009-0001-3940-4278. Contact: [ibonasa@liderarte.org](mailto:ibonasa@liderarte.org).