End Notes

Chapter 1

Readiness for Growth. There are many career paths of leaders as well as many factors that motivate leaders to grow, develop, and become their best self. A significant body of research describes these paths and motivations. Just using Sam as an example, we see her desire to stay positive despite challenges, the need for support and mentoring, the motivation to make the right decision, and also the desire to be true to herself or authenticity.

This book makes the central assumption that all leaders have a central organizing motivation: the desire to develop the best in themselves and to express this central self in the service of a higher principle, typically serving the greater good. Each of Sam's desires relates to or is served by this "best self" aspiration.

To learn more about leadership motivation and how it may shape one's career, please consider these articles and books. Of particular interest for "best self" motivation, readers might consider the book by Neck and Manz (2010), the dissertation by Yan (2011), and the special issue of *The Leadership Quarterly* (Avolio & Gardner, 2005).

Avolio, B. J., & Gardner, W. L. (2005). Authentic leadership development: Getting to the root of positive forms of leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *16*(3), 315–338.

Higgins, M. C., & Kram, K. E. (2001). Reconceptualizing mentoring at work: A developmental network perspective. *Academy of Management Review*, *26*(2), 264–288.

Komives, S. R., & Wagner, W. (Eds.). (2016). *Leadership for a Better World: Understanding the Social Change Model of Leadership Development*. John Wiley & Sons.

London, M. (2001). *Leadership Development: Paths to Self-Insight and Professional Growth*. Psychology Press.

Neck, C. P., & Manz, C. C. (2010). *Mastering Self-Leadership: Empowering Yourself for Personal Excellence*. Pearson.

Yan, W. (2011). *Eudaimonic orientation: The pursuit of the best self* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Missouri–Columbia).

Chapter 2

The Next Gen Leadership Program. The Next Gen program, while fictitious, represents a synthesis of business school and corporate leadership programs. Many students ask whether these programs are effective. Research from dozens of studies suggests that while programs can be highly effective, they may not always be so, and effectiveness often depends on the right combination of factors and the right fit between the student or manager and the program (e.g., Collins & Holton, 2004; Lacarenza, et al., 2017; Reyes, et al., 2019).

The current story attempts to bring in some factors that research suggests contributes to effective leadership development. Speaking generally, this includes making the program

voluntary to reinforce intrinsic motivation, identifying student needs beforehand, providing feedback, using multiple delivery methods (especially giving students a chance to practice), conducting spaced training sessions and face-to-face delivery, and making the effort to match training examples to actual job situations. It also involves providing coaching (MacKie, 2016).

More specifically, in regard to bringing out one's best self, we focus on training and coaching that could bring out one's strengths, talents, or authentic self. Also, studies on authentic leadership show that it is an important predictor of positive outcomes at work. While the study of actual authentic leadership training is new (e.g., Nübold et al., 2020; van Droffelaar & Jacobs, 2018), a wealth of studies on positive leadership, ethical leadership, and servant leadership shows these to be very promising (Cunha et al., 2020).

Collins, D. B., & Holton III, E. F. (2004). The effectiveness of managerial leadership development programs: A meta-analysis of studies from 1982 to 2001. *Human Resource Development Quarterly*, *15*(2), 217–248.

Cunha, M. P. E., Rego, A., Simpson, A., & Clegg, S. (2020). *Positive Organizational Behaviour: A Reflective Approach*. Routledge.

Lacarenza, C. N., Reyes, D. L., Marlow, S. L., Joseph, D. L., & Salas, E. (2017). Leadership training design, delivery, and implementation: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *102*(12), 1–33.

Nübold, A., Van Quaquebeke, N., & Hülsheger, U. R. (2020). Be(com)ing real: A multi-source and an intervention study on mindfulness and authentic leadership. *Journal of Business and Psychology*, *35*(4), 469–488.

Reyes, D. L., Dinh, J., Lacarenza, C. N., Marlow, S. L., Joseph, D. L., & Salas, E. (2019). The state of higher education leadership development program evaluation: A meta-analysis, critical review, and recommendations. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *30*(5), 1–15.

van Dam, K., van der Locht, M., & Chiaburu, D. (2013). Getting the most of management training— The role of identical elements for training transfer. *Personnel Review*, *42*(4).

van Droffelaar, B., & Jacobs, M. (2018). Nature-based training program fosters authentic leadership. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, *12*(3), 7–18.

Chapter 3

Head, Heart, Hands, and Feet. The idea that good leaders utilize multiple aspects of their self or personality—and as a whole person—is not new. In the late seventeenth century, the Swiss educational reformer, Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi, used the "head, hands, and heart" model as a central approach to developing the child as a whole person (cf. Brühlmeier, 2010).

The idea was later extended to leadership development by Nicholls (1994) and has been used as a general guide for managerial practice, including at Google (see Shah, 2015). Although the concept is discussed here as four separate skills, it is important to keep in mind that, as the person matures into a whole "best" self, all four are integrated and work together to bring out a higher state of wholeness and well-being (Dunn, 1961).

Brühlmeier, A. (2010). *Head, heart and hand: Education in the spirit of Pestalozzi*. Open Book Publishers.

Chua, R. Y. J., Ingram, P., & Morris, M. W. (2008). From the head and the heart: Locating cognition- and affect-based trust in managers' professional networks. *Academy of Management Journal*, *51*(3), 436–452.

Culp III, K., & Cox, K. J. (1997). Leadership styles for the new millennium: Creating new paradigms. *Journal of Leadership Studies*, *4*(1), 3–17.

Dunn, H. (1961). *High-Level Wellness*. Arlington, VA: Beatty.

Nicholls, J. (1994). The "heart, head and hands" of transforming leadership. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, *15*(6), 8.

Shah, R. (2015). Engaging employees in their feet, heart and head. (November 27, 2015). *Forbes* online.

Self-leadership. The concept of self-leadership, as discussed here, is based on the original work of Charles Manz (1986), which has resulted in a significant body of research. A simple definition of self-leadership is the process by which a person influences themselves to achieve their aims in life. The book by Christopher Neck and colleagues (2019) is an ideal place to start for a practical understanding with case studies. The self-leadership questionnaire (Houghton & Neck, 2002) and a brief version (Houghton et al., 2012) can also be found through Google Scholar. Examples (and dimensions) from these items include the following:

- I establish specific goals for my own performance (self-goal setting).
- I picture in my mind a successful performance before I actually do a task (visualizing performance).
- I talk to myself (out loud or in my head) to work through difficult situations (evaluating beliefs and assumptions).

Houghton, J. D., & Neck, C. (2002). The revised self-leadership questionnaire: Testing a hierarchical factor structure for self-leadership. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, *17*(8), 672–691.

Houghton, J. D., Dawley, D., & DiLiello, T. C. (2012). The abbreviated self-leadership questionnaire (ASLQ): A more concise measure of self-leadership. *International Journal of Leadership Studies*, *7*(2), 216–232.

Manz, C. C. (1986). Self-leadership: Toward an expanded theory of self-influence processes in organizations. *Academy of Management Review*, *11*(3), 585–600.

Neck, C. P., & Houghton, J. D. (2006). Two decades of self-leadership theory and research past developments, present trends, and future possibilities. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21(4), 270–295.

Neck, C. P., Manz, C. C., & Houghton, J. D. (2019). *Self-Leadership: The Definitive Guide to Personal Excellence*. Sage Publications.

Stewart, G. L., Courtright, S. H., & Manz, C. C. (2011). Self-leadership: A multilevel review. *Journal of Management*, *37*(1), 185–222.

Growth Mindset. Carol Dweck's work on growth mindset has been discussed broadly in the business literature. Employees who have a growth mindset or strong learning orientation are more likely to be engaged at work, find greater meaning in their jobs, have competence in their knowledge and skills, and show self-determination in making a strong impact on their work unit and organization (see Baek-Kyoo et al., 2019). It is not only

possible to encourage a growth mindset in students (Yeager et al., 2019), doing so may be the foundation for bringing out one's best self.

Baek-Kyoo, J. B., Bozer, G., & Ready, K. J. (2019). A dimensional analysis of psychological empowerment on engagement. *Journal of Organizational Effectiveness*, *6*(3), 186–203.

Dweck, C. (2012). *Mindset: Changing the Way You Think to Fulfill Your Potential*. Hachette UK.

Dweck, C. (2016). What having a "growth mindset" actually means. *Harvard Business Review*, *13*, 213–226.

Yeager, D. S., Hanselman, P., Walton, G. M., Murray, J. S., Crosnoe, R., Muller, C., ... & Dweck, C.S. (2019). A national experiment reveals where a growth mindset improves achievement. *Nature*, *573*(7774), 364–369.

Chapter 4

Leadership Coaching. The field of leadership and executive coaching has grown exponentially in recent years. Coaching differs from broader leadership development programs (like the fictional Next Gen program in this book), which uses more "baked in" curriculum and exercise. Leadership coaching is a one-to-one or individualized and customized process that attends to the specific career and work context of the individual and has been shown to improve self-reported leadership skills.

We recommend the book by MacKie (2016) on strengths-based leadership coaching. MacKie provides guidance on several factors associated with effective coaching that also help to bring out one's best self. This includes ensuring the coach is adequately trained and prepared, using self-assessments, obtaining assessments from multiple raters (360-degree feedback), assessing readiness, using tailored goal setting, and providing feedback, accountability, and challenges.

Bozer, G., & Jones, R. J. (2018). Understanding the factors that determine workplace coaching effectiveness: A systematic literature review. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology*, *27*(3), 342–361.

Ely, K., Boyce, L. A., Nelson, J. K., Zaccaro, S. J., Hernez-Broome, G., & Whyman, W. (2010). Evaluating leadership coaching: A review and integrated framework. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *21*(4), 585–599.

MacKie, D. (2014). The effectiveness of strength-based executive coaching in enhancing full range leadership development: A controlled study. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, *66*(2), 118.

MacKie, D. (2016). *Strength-Based Leadership Coaching in Organizations: An Evidence-Based Guide to Positive Leadership Development*. Kogan Page Publishers.

Rekalde, I., Landeta, J., Albizu, E., & Fernandez-Ferrin, P. (2017). Is executive coaching more effective than other management training and development methods? *Management Decision*, *55*(10), 2149–2162.

Chapter 5

Strength Assessments. As the chapter explains, there are different approaches to assessing strengths in personality and in leadership and through the lens of positive psychology. Here are a few of the most popular ones:

a. Gallup's CliftonStrengths® assessment (previously StrengthsFinder®): This is a personality-based instrument that measures talent in four domains of strategic thinking, executing, relationship building, and influencing. The standard assessment gives a person their Top 5 Themes (from thirty-four possibilities) and costs $20 on Gallup's website; there is also an All 34 Themes report available for a cost of $50. Someone who has a Top 5 Report can upgrade to the All 34 report for $40. Gallup Certified Strengths Coaches receive a discount of $10 on each of these assessments. Contact author Ben Dilla (who is Gallup certified) through our website, YourBestSelfAtWork.org, if you would like to take this assessment, upgrade a previous report, or discuss your results.

b. The VIA Inventory of Strengths (VIA-IS), formerly known as the Values in Action Inventory, is a 240-item measure of twenty-four character strengths grouped into six factors or virtues (wisdom/knowledge, courage, justice, humanity, temperance, and transcendence). While there are some parallels to the four domains of CliftonStrengths®, the VIA framework is more conceptual and not based on statistics. The online assessment with basic report (rank ordering of the twenty-four themes) is free. The Top 5 Report with in-depth analysis of your signature strengths is $19, and Total 24 report, including analysis by virtue categories is $49. There is also an option for a Team Report with Top 5 Strengths of three to fifteen individuals on a team for $15 per person. https://www.viacharacter.org/

c. Strengths Profile (previously known as the Realise2 Inventory) is an online self-assessment that provides feedback on sixty possible strengths, dividing them into your realized strengths, unrealized strengths, learned behaviors, and weaknesses. The sixty strengths are also grouped into five strengths families, which include being, communicating, motivating, relating, and thinking. The Introductory Profile costs $14, the Expert Profile is $40, and a Team Profile is $110. https://strengthsprofile.com

d. StandOut 2.0 (and the original StandOut) was developed by Marcus Buckingham, who was also instrumental in developing Gallup's CliftonStrengths® assessment. This assessment uses thirty-four situational judgment questions to assess eighteen talents which are paired together into nine strength roles. The report provides your rank order of all nine with a focus on your top two roles (primary and secondary) and how they work together. You can purchase the assessment online for $15 or buy the book for about the same cost, including a key code for the assessment. https://standout.tmbc.com

e. Strengthscope® was developed in Europe and is used globally. The model has twenty-four strengths divided into four groups (relational, execution, thinking, and emotional) similar to the four CliftonStrengths® domains. The standard self-assessment report provides results on all twenty-four strengths (graphed in a circle with your strengths as spokes, shown in comparison to their normative group) and a focus on your Significant 7 top strengths. Strengthscope offers multiple options besides the standard individual report, including a 360-degree feedback profile, a leadership profile, and a team report. You must purchase Strengthscope from a certified practitioner; see website for costs, which are comparable to other strength assessments: https://www.strengthscope.com/

f. Qualitative 360/Reflected Best Self Exercise™: For a completely different approach, you could do a Qualitative 360 by asking colleagues, friends, and others who know you well to identify your main talents and strengths and analyzing their feedback for common themes that define "your best self."
There is a proprietary tool, the Reflected Best Self Exercise™, developed by scholars at the Center for Positive Organizations at the University of Michigan, which requires permission to use or payment of $75 to use their platform, https://reflectedbestselfexercise.com/. No permission is needed to use a Qualitative 360 process as described here; the process has been published in *Harvard Business Review* and *Academy of Management Journal* and is in the public domain. Please contact Ben Dilla if you want more details or would like him to facilitate the process of gathering your feedback.

The references that follow provide a sample of some key source texts for the interested reader. The chapter by Rashid (2015) provides a thorough introduction on assessments and the book by Simmons and Lehmann (2012) is a compendium of dozens of strengths-based assessment tools. The four-factor model and corresponding assessment used in this chapter represents an elementary attempt to synthesize these models for the purpose of providing a basic orientation and introduction to readers. More rigorous studies may be found by following up on the references provided here.

Donaldson, S. I., Lee, J. Y., & Donaldson, S. I. (2019). Evaluating positive psychology interventions at work: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *International Journal of Applied Positive Psychology*, *4*(3), 113–134.

Fredrickson, B. L. (2001). The role of positive emotions in positive psychology: The broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions. *American Psychologist*, *56*(3), 218.

Hodges, T. D., & Clifton, D. O. (2004). Strengths-based development in practice. *Positive Psychology in Practice*, *1*, 256–268.

Peterson, C., & Seligman, M. E. (2004). *Character Strengths and Virtues: A Handbook and Classification* (Vol. 1). Oxford University Press.

Rashid, T. (2015). Strength-based assessment. In *Positive Psychology in Practice: Promoting Human Flourishing in Work, Health, Education, and Everyday Life, Second Edition*, 519–542.

Simmons, C., & Lehmann, P. (2012). *Tools for Strengths-Based Assessment and Evaluation*. Springer Publishing Company.

Youssef, C. M., & Luthans, F. (2007). Positive organizational behavior in the workplace: The impact of hope, optimism, and resilience. *Journal of Management*, *33*(5), 774–800.

The Big Five Model of Personality Traits. Otherwise known as the Five-Factor Model, this well-studied and popular approach to understanding personality first examines those attributes, traits, or adjectives that people use to describe themselves and others and then derives the most basic categories to cluster those traits. The model was originally credited to Tupes and Christal (1961) and then more fully developed by McCrae and Costa (1987).

Regarding leadership, the Big Five is understood as a dispositional approach—that is, the claim is sometimes made that we can fully understand and explain leadership behavior by reference to the internal disposition or character of an individual. A key question in this research is "What type of leadership relates to the Big Five?" For example, one meta-analysis suggests that the Big Five may not be sufficient for understanding

Chapter 6

Emotional Intelligence. Early psychologists such as E. J. Thorndike in the 1920s had theories about social intelligence, and Gardner's (1983) concept of multiple intelligences included both intrapersonal intelligence (knowing oneself) and interpersonal intelligence (understanding feelings and emotions in others).

Contemporary interest in the topic traces back to Daniel Goleman's (1995) book, *Emotional Intelligence*, as well as Goleman's (1998a) article in *Harvard Business Review*, "What makes a leader?" which tied the concept directly to leadership effectiveness. We recommend Goleman's (1998b) book *Working with Emotional Intelligence* for a thorough discussion of workplace applications. Also, *Emotional Intelligence 2.0* by Bradberry and Greaves (2009) provides a very accessible discussion of the four facets of EI discussed here and includes an online assessment with strong face validity and practical suggestions for improvement of each facet of EI.

A key distinction in the research literature is between trait EI and ability-based EI, although measurement of the latter has proven to be problematic (Petrides, 2011). We use EI here in both senses—first, as a trait-like construct that people possess in varying degrees and also as a set of skills and behaviors that can be developed and improved, based on research evidence (Mattingly & Kraiger, 2019).

Bradberry, T., & Greaves, J. (2009). *Emotional Intelligence 2.0*. TalentSmart.

Gardner, H. (1983). *Frames of Mind: The Theory of Multiple Intelligences*. Basic Books.

Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional Intelligence*. Bantam Books.

Goleman, D. (1998a). What makes a leader? *Harvard Business Review, 76,* 93–102.

Goleman, D. (1998b). *Working with Emotional Intelligence*. Bantam Books.

Mattingly, V., & Kraiger, K. (2019). Can emotional intelligence be trained? A meta-analytical investigation. *Human Resource Management Review, 29*(2), 140–155.

Petrides, K. V. (2011). Ability and trait emotional intelligence. In T. Chamorro-Premuzic, S. von Stumm, & A. Furnham (Eds.), *The Wiley-Blackwell Handbooks of Individual Differences* (p. 656–678). Wiley-Blackwell.

Chapter 7

Strength-based Leadership. The book *Strengths Based Leadership* by Rath and Conchie (2008) has stimulated both applied and basic research into strengths for leadership, including case studies (Welch et al, 2014) and quantitative studies (e.g., Kong & Ho, 2016). The edited volume by Oades et al. (2017) and textbook by Cunha et al. (2020) provide extensive references for a broader analysis of strength-based approaches at work.

Cunha, M. P., Rego, A., Simpson, A., & Clegg, S. (2020). *Positive Organizational Behaviour: A Reflective Approach*. Routledge.

Kong, D. T., & Ho, V. T. (2016). A self-determination perspective of strengths use at work: Examining its determinant and performance implications. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, *11*(1), 15–25.

Oades, L. G., Steger, M., Delle Fave, A., & Passmore, J. (Eds.). (2017). *The Wiley-Blackwell Handbook of the Psychology of Positivity and Strengths-based Approaches at Work*. John Wiley & Sons.

Rath, T., & Conchie, B. (2008). *Strengths based leadership: Great leaders, teams, and why people follow*. Simon and Schuster.

Welch, D., Grossaint, K., Reid, K., & Walker, C. (2014). Strengths-based leadership development: Insights from expert coaches. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, *66*(1), 20.

Chapter 10

The Five Cs of Resilience. The Five Cs were originally developed by Bennett and Aden (2011) following a synthesis of the literature on personal resilience and then applying those concepts to a formulation of team resilience (Bennett et al., 2010; 2018). In a meta-analysis of resilience interventions, Leppin et al. (2014) stated that the Five Cs framework is supported theoretically. A more comprehensive model of resilience, consistent with the Five Cs, is described in Bennett (2018; 2020) and Hartmann et al. (2020).

Bennett, J. B. (2018). Integral Organizational Wellness™: An evidence-based model of socially inspired well-being. *Journal of Applied Biobehavioral Research*, *23*(4), e12136.

Bennett, J. B. (2020). Resilience 3.0: Multi-level approaches are essential. *Worksite Health International. 11*(3), 8–12.

Bennett, J. B., & Aden, C. (2011). Team resilience: Health promotion for young restaurant workers. In Bray, J.W., Galvin, D.M., & Cluff, L.A., Eds. *Young Adults in the Workplace: A Multisite Initiative of Substance Use Prevention Programs*. RTI Press Publication No. BK-0005-1103. RTI Press.

Bennett, J.B., Aden, C. A., Broome, K & Mitchell, K., & Rigdon, D. (2010). Team resilience for young restaurant workers: Research-to-practice adaptation and assessment. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 15(3):223–236.

Bennett, J. B., Neeper, M., Linde, B. D., Lucas, G. M., & Simone, L. (2018). Team resilience training in the workplace: E-learning adaptation, measurement model, and two pilot studies. *JMIR Mental Health*, *5*(2), e35.

Hartmann, S., Weiss, M., Newman, A., & Hoegl, M. (2020). Resilience in the workplace: A multilevel review and synthesis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *69*(3), 913–959.

Leppin A. L., Bora P. R., Tilburt, J. C., Gionfriddo, M. R., Zeballos-Palacio, C., Dulohery, M. M., et al. (2014). The efficacy of resiliency training programs: A systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized trials. *PLoS ONE 9*(10), e111420.