Impacting Well-Doing at Work: A Practice-Oriented Leader Framework

Charles D. Kerns
Pepperdine University
Corperformance, Inc.

Emerging evidence indicating the positive outcomes associated with well-doing behavior in workplace settings makes well-doing a valuable topic for leaders to understand, apply and impact. When engaging in well-doing behaviors managerial leaders help make value-added contributions which benefit others. After reviewing some relevant literature, a practice-oriented framework is presented to operationalize well-doing across four phases. The application value and implications of this framework in policy, practice, research and teaching are discussed. Some challenges connected to helping managerial leaders positively impact well-doing at work are offered. These challenges include finding practical ways to develop well-doing and communicate its importance to policy makers as well as developing additional measurement tools for practitioners to assess their impact when applying well-doing behaviors to benefit others across organizational levels.

Keywords: well-doing, assessment, virtues, virtuousness, proactivity, intentionality, stakeholders, leader identity, impact

INTRODUCTION

Well-doing is connected to human flourishing and virtuousness and can be addressed from diverse perspectives at many levels. In the context of organizational leadership, I will focus on well-doing as a process which leaders can use to produce desired outcomes for stakeholders. [1] It is a multifaceted construct which is relevant, applicable and impactful when operationalized and effectively practiced by leaders. Unfortunately, there is a paucity of frameworks and tools found in the extant literature to help practitioners develop and promote effective well-doing. **In this article, "well-doing" is defined as proactively behaving and intentionally responding to situations in virtuous ways that make value-added contributions which benefit others.**

There is broad and diverse literature to draw upon when seeking to define and operationalize well-doing in a way that has relevance and practical utility for organizational leaders, policymakers and their stakeholders. The emerging science of virtue, for example, connects with well-doing (Fowers, et al 2020; Wright, et al 2021). As part of this work, Fowers (2014) has offered, some common elements that are associated with virtues and also align with well-doing including:

- They are executed with the intention of doing some good
- They need to be expressed in observable behavior
- They have motivation and affective components
- When measured over time they show consistency

- They involve having knowledge on how best to act
- They draw upon practical wisdom that involves the capacity to recognize the most appropriate course of action in specific situations.

Closely associated with virtue is the idea of eudaimonia and meaningful work (Chalofsky & Cavallaro, 2019). More broadly, eudaimonia, which dates back to Aristotle, relates to leading a virtuous life centering around meaning, growing and excellence (Sheldon, et al, 2019). Martin Seligman (2002), the father of positive psychology, distinguishes the good life from a meaningful life. The good life or hedonia involves applying one's core character strengths to enjoyable activities while the meaningful life concerns eudaimonia or using character strengths, which are aligned with one's virtues, in the service of something greater than oneself. Transcendent motivation is connected to pursuing eudaimonia or a meaningful life. The pursuit of meaningful work, eudaimonia and well-doing are overlapping concepts. Further, eudaimonic well-being has been equated with virtuousness and defined as being well in a moral way (Cameron, 2022). Virtuousness is aligned with the eudaimonic belief that human beings are inclined to move toward moral goodness Fowers (2012). There is some evidence that virtuousness is inherited and evolutionarily developed (Jaeger & van Vugt, 2022). Further, human brain research suggests that individuals seem to have a basic instinct to be moral and are biologically predisposed to be virtuous (Hauser, 2006).

The construct of virtuousness in the extant academic literature is addressed using varying definitions and a broad array of attributes to describe it. Based on a review of scholarly publications, Cameron (2022) observed that virtuousness is rarely connected to leadership and hardly ever with organizations. This circumstance leaves practitioners largely with only conceptually oriented debates/discourse to consider including whether virtuousness even exists. The current article seeks to provide a practice-oriented resource for leaders to consider when seeking to operationalize and apply well-doing in organizational settings as a construct which aligns with virtuousness. In fact, key components of the proffered framework such as virtues, virtuous values, beliefs and character strengths help operationalize and bring practical utility to the concept of virtuousness for practitioners.

Self-determination theory (SDT), as espoused by Ryan and Deci (2017), puts forth the proposition that there are specific basic psychological needs for autonomy, competence and relatedness which when met within appropriate cultural contexts of an individual's development, facilitate growth, integrity, and well-being. It seems that well doers are the beneficiaries when they are able to proactively and intentionally contribute in ways that enhance the lives of others and their communities. Autonomy, trust, and support have been found to be important antecedents of proactive work behavior, and overlap significantly with the SDT's basic psychological needs of autonomy, competence and relatedness (Parker et al, 2010). Further, high levels of personal initiative in combination with other well-doing related factors such as, a high autonomous operating work environment encourage proactive behavior (Grant et al, 2011).

Self-Determination Theory (SDT) also connects with meaning, motivation and wellness. Accordingly, individuals are able to make contributions to the greater good when they are guided by their internal value system. While values and giving for the greater good are integral to a meaningful workplace, what seems most consequential in determining whether individuals experience meaning and purpose from their work is the alignment of their values with their internal meaning making self-view systems (Ryan & Deci, 2017). Values management, especially virtuous values, are important to the study of well-doing (Kerns 2017). Separating values into terminal and instrumental values may also hold application value for the practice and study of well-doing (Rokeach, 1973).

While a distinguishing feature of well-doing is the well-doer's motivation to serve and help others, doing good for others likely simultaneously positively impacts the well-doer's well-being (Titova & Shelton, 2021). Further, there is evidence that the identity of well-doers around well-doing may be strengthened as they integrate doing good for others into their self-view systems (Wang & Hackett, 2020). Well-doing actions may likely strengthen an internalized set of leader self-views which contributes further to their sense of flourishing by being a meaningful contributor in the world (Hannah et al, 2009; Kerns, 2022a; Ryan & Deci, 2017). This observation aligns with the recent work relating to answering life's biggest question, i.e., how one most meaningfully contributes to the world (Rath, 2020).

Taken together, the above observations relating to well-doing provide some useful perspectives and resources from which to draw upon when working to better understand and apply well-doing to organizations and leadership. Given the evidence that leadership matters in helping enhance performance, well-being and well-doing in organizations, it seems important to develop approaches to focus on these areas. In particular, the practical applications of well-doing to the practice of leadership in organizational settings is especially needed in the development of leaders. This need is supported by the mounting evidence of managerial leadership incompetence, ineffectiveness and/or abuse (Örtenblad, 2021). Effective leader well-doing may help in addressing this bad leadership problem (Kerns, 2021a). Further, given all the theoretical conceptualizing and debate around concepts and notions which relate to well-doing, it seems timely and important to focus this construct's application to leadership.

WELL-DOING AND LEADERSHIP

In the context of leadership, well-doing can be reviewed across five core dimensions.[2] These five dimensions are briefly reviewed below.

First, individual difference making factors come into play when addressing leader well-doing (Kerns, 2015a). In particular, virtuous values as a subset of a leader's core values system need to be identified, prioritized and clarified (Kerns, 2017). This is important because values influence how a leader sees people and situations and how they ultimately act towards others. Virtuous values provide a moral foundation for leaders to act virtuously as part of well-doing. In addition, leaders' virtue-oriented character strengths are a valuable individual difference making factor in well-doing. Taken together, virtuous values when aligned with a leader's character strengths help support leader well-doing. Further, personality traits/attributes such as proactivity, learning agility, selfishness and altruism, along with their behavioral manifestations, can influence a leader's propensity to engage in acts of well-doing.

Second, leaders' motivations for choosing to lead and influence well-doing behaviors (Chan & Drasgow, 2001; Kerns, 2015b). In practice, a leader's motivations to lead can be characterized as self-oriented, career consideration focused and/or transcendent. The latter motivation relating to transcendence aligns with leaders who are motivated to do things for others and to serve for reasons beyond themselves. Transcendently motivated leaders tend to engage in altruistic and prosocial behaviors because it is the right thing to do. Displaying these well-doing related behaviors over time becomes part of their self-view system and leader identity relating to well-doing. Through the process of habituation, a leader's well-doing identity strengthens (Wang & Hackett, 2020).

Third, situational context is an important dimension to address when considering leader well-doing. Leaders bring their unique profile of relevant resources, including their capacity to discern what is going on in specific situations, to their daily encounters (Kerns, 2015c). Self-awareness and situational awareness combined with practical wisdom are important in helping leaders discern which actions to take regarding specific situational circumstances. When considering virtue and character types, Fowers (2014) describes the ideal type of character as the virtuous individual who consistently acts in ways that are appropriate to specific situations. Part of being a well-doing leader is knowing who you are, what is going on around you and how you can best respond to situations to make a virtuous value-added contribution.

Fourth, while conceptually separated from the situational context dimension, in practice, competencies dynamically interact with situational circumstances. Leaders need to have the capacity to competently act once they decide what is the right thing to do. Well-doing leaders bring who they are, which includes the behavioral manifestations of their virtue-oriented character strengths and transcendent motivation(s), to situations as antecedents to competently doing the right thing. I have also found decisive problem-solving (Kerns, 2016a), high impact communicating (Kerns, 2016b), and well-being enhancing practices (Kerns, 2018a) to be useful in helping leaders practice effective well-doing.

Results management is the fifth dimension that is relevant to leader well-doing. Over the last several decades, as part of practicing, researching and teaching leadership, I have identified three core results for leaders to strive to achieve which are performance, well-being and well-doing. As part of the results management dimension these three core results interact with the other four dimensions. Measuring,

evaluating and optimizing the impacts of a leader's well-doing actions on the achievement of desired outcomes is addressed and accounted for in the proffered leader practice-oriented framework.

All of the five core dimensions benefit from having practice-oriented frameworks and tools to help leaders effectively execute their roles. To this end as it relates to enhancing leader well-doing, the next section in this article offers a well-doing leader practice-oriented framework. This framework includes providing a way for practitioners to operationalize virtuousness by systematically applying virtue-oriented values in alignment with guiding principles and behavioral practices that can proactively and intentionally be applied by leaders in specific situations to positively impact well-doing.

WELL-DOING LEADER PRACTICE-ORIENTED FRAMEWORK

Well-doing is a multifaceted construct which is relevant, applicable and impactful when operationalized and effectively practiced by leaders. As well-doers, leaders act responsibly beyond self-interests with good intentions to do what is right and virtuous (Cameron, 2022; Shi & Ye, 2016). In this article, **"well-doing" is defined as proactively behaving and intentionally responding to situations in ways that make value-added contributions which benefit others**. Well-doing is operationalized through a practice-oriented framework. **The process of positively impacting well-doing in the context of managerial leadership is operationally defined as follows: Identifying, clarifying and affirming well-doing related values, attributes and behaviors for executing and optimizing while measuring and evaluating impacts**.

Many opportunities are available for practitioners, policymakers, researchers and teachers to draw upon knowledge relating to impacting well-doing. The framework presented below applies this knowledge by building upon observations and experiences I have gleaned from working with a broad range of leaders across many different settings. Drawing upon fieldwork, applied research and teaching-consulting, together with relevant literature reviews, over the past four decades I have made the following observations about well-doing in the context of managerial leadership.

- Well-doing is a multifaceted construct that includes subjects such as virtue, prosocial behavior, proactivity, intentionality, altruism, values management, practical wisdom, stakeholder analysis, and identity-based habits.
- Responsible leadership, effective well-doing and virtuousness relate to doing good to produce good or virtuous dividends (Cameron, 2022; Kempster et al, 2019).
- There is evidence that well-doing behaviors can be positively impacted by and advanced through education, training and development (Hardré & Reeve, 2009; Little, 2017).
- Developing leader-identity based habits relating to well-doing helps promote and sustain well-doing behavior (Clear, 2018; Sheldon, 2018).
- The scientific study of virtues and brain science are emerging as fields that hold promise for enhancing the practice of well-doing as it relates to leadership (Fowers et al, 2020; O'Mara, 2018; Zak, 2018).
- Virtuousness can be operationalized by effectively managing a virtuous values – beliefs – behavior chain (Kerns, 2003).
- The study of motivations to lead connects with the construct of well-doing, especially as it relates to transcendent motivation. Also, self-transcendence (looking beyond one's own interest for the greater good of others) connects with well-doing and seems to be associated with a number of aspects relating to well-being. (Aldwin et al, 2019; Kerns, 2015b).
- Optimizing virtuousness and well-doing related behaviors can positively impact desired organizational outcomes (Cameron, 2022).
- Well-doing and virtuous behavior are connected to wise reasoning which is an aspect of decisive problem-solving and practical wisdom, both of which are important managerial leadership practices. This competency helps leaders make value-added contributions (Kerns, 2020a; Cianciolo & Sternberg, 2018).

- Some of the work being done in applying ways to positively impact well-being in workplace settings can likely be applied to efforts in developing and enhancing well-doing (Kerns, 2018a).
- Expertise, deliberate practice and habit management strategies can be applied to managing well-doing (Carden & Wood, 2018; Harvey et al, 2021).
- Leader identity formation and learning across one's lifespan can contribute to developing well-doing identities (Kerns, 2022a; Kerns, 2018b).
- Sustainability, especially as it relates to human capital, is a topic that needs to be investigated further as it relates to leadership, stakeholder governance and setting organizational policy in the context of leader well-doing (Kempster, 2022; O'Mara-Schimek, 2015).
- Innovative and practical ways need to be further developed for measuring well-doing in organizational settings (Ng & Tay, 2020; Wright et al, 2021).
- Psychological selfishness has relevance and application value to the study and practice of well-doing (Carlson, et al 2022).
- Significant negative impacts on health, well-being and families are associated with poor leadership (Harms et al, 2017).
- The significant prevalence of ineffective, incompetent and/or abusive leadership needs to be more fully addressed by policymakers and organizational leaders with an eye toward applying well-doing strategies to help constructively address this unsettling situation (Kerns, 2021a; Örtenblad, 2021).

An integrated framework to help leaders enhance their well-doing effectiveness by positively impacting well-doing is depicted below in Figure 1. This framework has been adapted and applied in diverse settings including work organizations, executive education classrooms and field studies. The model is practitioner friendly and conceptually tied to relevant literature relating to leadership well-doing, well-being, proactive behavior, the scientific study of virtue as well as identity-based habit management processes.

In the framework the four phases are offered in chronological order of the most basic provisions for impacting well-doing; however, the phases are interrelated and in practice are dynamically interactive. The discussion that follows reviews the phases depicted in Figure 1 and the interplay among them.

FIGURE 1
IMPACTING WELL-DOING LEADER PRACTICE-ORIENTED FRAMEWORK ©

Phase I: Assessing – Prioritizing – Clarifying	Phase II: Affirming – Understanding	Phase III: Integrating – Optimizing	Phase IV: Measuring - Evaluating
▪ Completing the Values in Action (VIA) Survey (Peterson & Seligman, 2004) ▪ Core Values Profiling Prioritizing Checklist (VPPC) (Kerns, 2016c) ▪ Well-doing Virtuous Leading Checklist (WDVL-C) (Kerns, 2021b) ▪ Targeting Virtuous Values/Character Strengths (Niemiec & McGrath, 2019) ▪ Virtue/ Virtuousness Scales (Aguirre-Y-Luker et al, 2017) ▪ Virtuous Leadership Questionnaire (VLQ) (Hackett & Wang, 2012; Wang & Hackett, 2016) ▪ Values System Prioritizing Matrix (Kerns, 2004) ▪ Life-Span Leadership Review (Kerns, 2018b) ▪ Behavior-Flex Scale (Kerns, 2020b), Learning Agility Assessment (Hoff & Burke, 2017) ▪ Proactive Behavior (Parker et al, 2010)	▪ Consulting trusted others ▪ Asking self-strategic questions ▪ Reassessing core virtuous values related character strengths as appropriate and needed ▪ Reflecting on Life-Span Leader Experience Review-People, Events, Situations (Kerns, 2018b) ▪ Understanding and applying the Beliefs/Principles for Virtuous Leadership in managing well-doing ▪ Mapping and reviewing "means vs. ends" and individual vs. shared goal setting dynamics (Fowers, 2012; Kerns, 2005) ▪ Using well-doing selfishness matrix to better understand self-serving vs. authentic well-doing behavior (Kerns, 2022b; Carlson et al, 2022) ▪ Understanding unique virtue-oriented character strength profile/patterns (Wright, et al, 2021)	▪ Developing Virtuous Values – Character Strengths Statement ▪ Documenting Guiding Principles/Guideposts/Beliefs for Managing Well-Doing ▪ Specifying key behavioral practices to optimize well-doing in alignment with virtuous values virtue-oriented character strengths ▪ Document and integrate well-doing identity based on Phases I and II work ▪ Gain experience and practice ▪ Learn, grow and execute Well-Doing Identity ▪ Obtain outsight and practice critical self-reflection ▪ Identifying and targeting key stakeholders	▪ Assess key results/outcomes achievement ▪ Review key impacts ▪ Measure/index level of high-performance with high well-being ▪ Track Accountability Behavioral Integrity Index ▪ Make feedback-based changes/adjustments regarding behavioral targets for optimizing well-doing

© Copyright (2019; revised 2022) Charles D. Kerns, Ph.D.

Phase I: Assessing – Prioritizing – Clarifying

While there is a long history of theorizing and studying virtue, the development of assessment tools is a relatively new area of study. Various assessment tools are available for identifying, prioritizing and clarifying one's virtue-oriented values, and related character strengths. For example, the values in action (VIA) questionnaire consists of a 240-item questionnaire that assesses one's virtuous values and related character strengths stemming from a universe of twenty-four character strengths (Peterson and Seligman, 2004). Upon completing this questionnaire, respondents are provided with a list of their five highest rated areas which are considered "signature strengths". Additional assessment tools are being developed such as the Well-Doing Virtuous Leading Checklist which integrates many of the virtues found in the virtue literature (Kerns, 2021b; Aguirre-Y-Luker et al, 2017). There are also some relevant assessment instruments found in the virtue-based measurement of leadership (Ng & Tay, 2020; Riggio, et al, 2010; Wang & Hackett, 2016). A lifespan leadership developmental review process has proven useful in helping assess and clarify virtuous values and character strengths (Kerns, 2018b). Behavioral flexibility and proactivity are also important areas to assess in relationship to managing well-doing (Kerns, 2020a, Hoff & Burke, 2017; Parker et al, 2010). An important part of Phase I is helping leaders prioritize and clarify their virtue-oriented values and character strengths using a values systems prioritizing matrix (Kerns, 2004).

Phase II: Affirming – Understanding

When one's virtuous values and related character strengths have been identified, prioritized and clarified, it is important that they are affirmed and understood. This process of affirming and understanding includes seeking input from others to confirm agreement with the identified virtuous values and character strengths. These consultations should be with individuals who know the person well and are capable of offering credible feedback. The intent of this feedback is to help leaders more fully understand how their virtuous values and character strengths are reflected in their leadership behaviors.

A number of topics become important for leaders to understand in the context of their efforts to positively impact well-doing. Values management and how this process relates to influencing beliefs and behaviors can help leaders better understand how virtue-oriented values are shaped and sustained (Kerns, 2017; Kerns, 2004). It is especially important for leaders to recognize the possibility of there being misalignment between their espoused virtuous values and those promulgated by their organization. Recognizing and understanding a leader's level of proactivity and intentionality in displaying well-doing behaviors is important to developing habits characteristic of well-doers.

Reflecting on life experiences relating to the influence of key people, events and situations which connect a leader to virtue-oriented values and character strengths helps further assist in affirming and understanding. Considering and reviewing "the means vs. ends" and "individual vs. shared" orientation to goal setting further helps to strengthen one's understanding of well-doing as both a process and organizational outcome (Fowers, 2012; Kerns, 2005). One's unique virtue-oriented character strength profile offers additional insights and understandings (Wright et al, 2021). To help leaders consider self-serving behaviors in relationship to well-doing behavior and to look more closely at their tendencies to be self-serving, a well-doing – selfishness matrix has been developed (Kerns, 2022b).

Phase III: Integrating – Optimizing

After affirming and acquiring a fuller understanding of one's core virtuous values and character strengths, a number of practical and value-added actions can be taken to help integrate and optimize the execution of those core virtuous values and character strengths. For example, developing a virtuous values – character strengths statement can provide a foundation on which to build a set of guiding principles and beliefs for managing well-doing. These guiding principles/beliefs will help leaders to optimize and integrate the execution of core virtuous values and character strengths into their work. These guiding principles/beliefs help to frame and formulate key behavioral practices that support leaders in optimizing well-doing in alignment with their virtuous values and character strengths. Taken together, the virtuous values/character strength statement, guiding principles and behavioral practices form a values-beliefs-

behavior chain which helps leaders operationalize virtuousness in an authentic and personalized way (Kerns, 2017; Kerns, 2003).

Developing and documenting a well-doing identity profile (Kerns, 2022a) based on the work done in phases I and II helps leaders integrate well-doing into their approach to leadership. When well-doing is part of a leader's identity it is likely that their tendency to exhibit well-doing behaviors will be strengthened. Their well-doing identity will accompany them as they learn, grow and execute leadership roles. During this process outsight (feedback from others) and self-reflection will also likely strengthen their well-doing identity-based habits. Organizational leaders and policy makers, on an ongoing basis, need to collaboratively identify and target key stakeholders and specify shared goals which will advance through effective well-doing.

Phase IV: Measuring – Evaluating

Measuring and evaluating the impact that one's efforts have on attaining key results and other important outcomes is key to this framework. Measuring and evaluating well-doing along with performance and well-being is especially important in determining whether leaders are acting in alignment with their core virtuous values and character strengths at work. When leaders continuously strive to optimize their well-doing, stakeholders benefit and shared goals are more likely realized. Feedback and the associated insights obtained from this measurement and evaluation process help leaders and policy making bodies implement organizational and behavioral changes that help optimize and integrate core virtuous values/character strengths which contributes to enhancing effective well-doing (Phase III).

APPLICATION VALUE AND IMPLICATIONS

Efforts to positively impact well-doing has application value and implications for policymakers, practitioners, researchers and teachers.

Policy Domain

Over the past decade organizational policy makers and executives have received increasingly more attention as it relates to creating value for a diverse array of stakeholders as opposed to a primary focus on enhancing shareholder wealth (Amis et al, 2020). Concerns relate to whether traditional corporate governance practices work in current organizational operating environments. Important discussions can be had around what things can be done to ensure that all parties involved in the organizational value creation process, from boards of directors to line employees, are guided by well-doing rather than acting in ways that foster ill-doing (Kaiser et al, 2015).

Corporate governance and leadership are frequently considered separately by academics and practitioners (Yar Hamidi, 2014). Corporate governance is commonly defined and discussed from legal or regulatory perspectives, while leadership is approached from a behavioral and organizational science perspective. In this article, leadership at all organizational levels is seen as vital when endeavoring to positively impact well-doing and is operationalized by executing the proffered leader practice-oriented framework.

It seems valuable for policymakers to consider adapting an "everyday leadership" perspective when striving to make well-doing a foundational organizational outcome. Drawing from the recent work of Liu, et al (2022) as well as Kouzes & Posner (2021), everyday leadership is seen as the behaviors displayed by individuals who, regardless of formal title or authority, influence others to achieve desired objectives for the benefit of the collective. From a perspective of enhancing well-doing, all individuals in the organization would see themselves as leaders having the responsibility to proactively and intentionally influence the organization's level of well-doing. This perspective is aligned with the growing extant literature and study of responsible leadership and related business practices which seek to create good or virtuous dividends (Cameron, 2022; Kempster et al, 2019; Shi & Ye, 2016). These efforts in the context of the current work have leaders (regardless of title and position) putting self-serving behaviors aside and attending to each other's needs for the common good. Well-doing is enhanced when leaders manage their virtuous values,

beliefs and behaviors at all organizational levels with transcendent motivations that extend beyond their self-interests for the benefit of others (i.e., they strengthen their identities as organizational well-doers). Sufficient numbers of well-doers in an organization likely diminish the impact of selfishness and self-serving behaviors while strengthening a culture of well-doing at all organizational levels. Responsible leadership and well-doing go hand-in-hand in helping organizations create value.

From a strategic perspective, actions of boards of directors and other policymakers are critical to creating and sustaining well-doing throughout an organization. Value is in turn created through the engagement with stakeholders across key spheres of influence (Kerns, 2015c). It is useful to consider the creation of organizational value across the following six areas as suggested by the International Integrated Reporting Council and further considered by Cikaliuk et al (2022).

1. Intellectual Capital (Ideas)
2. Human Capital (People)
3. Social and Relationship Capital (Society)
4. Natural Capital (Environment)
5. Financial Capital (Fiscal; Material Goods)
6. Manufactured Capital (Fixed Assets)

These areas, or capitals, taken together, form a framework which creates organizational value (Cikaliuk et al, 2022). These capitals are dynamic and interactive. They can be optimized or depleted. Optimizing these six capitals likely promotes well-doing while diminishing selfishness and self-serving leader behaviors which underscores that well-doing actions are not driven only by individual or corporate advancement. Stakeholders are likely to recognize when an organization's well-doing is driven primarily by maximizing shareholder wealth as compared to other transcendent motivations. This perceptiveness can convert to value enhancing or value diminishing behavior. Motivation, in these instances, can likely be viewed as important as overt behaviors (Cikaliuk et al, 2022).

From this vantage point, policy makers, as responsible leaders, are counseled to ensure that their well-doing actions are aligned with their intentions across key multilevel spheres of influence including core organizational identity, and internal operating, transactional and extended external environments (Kerns, 2015; Maak & Pless, 2019). Effective well-doing finds transcendent motivations aligning with value-added contributions which benefit others and the common good. These investments across the six capitals and stakeholder groups enhance positive relationships while likely strengthening trust among and between stakeholders (Doh & Quigley, 2014).

Effective leader well-doing behaviors along with responsible leadership practices such as strategically identifying specific stakeholders, collaboratively setting goals and making commitments motivated by well-doing are integral to establishing interactive partnerships in service to stakeholders. Investing in leadership development, establishing prosocial policies and implementing professional performance-based selection processes which help identify well-doers are likely to boost organizational well-doing.

When considering optimizing the various capitals, policymakers in organizations should address the ill-doing that incompetent, ineffective and/or abusive leaders have on their organizations. Given the base rate for bad leadership in excess of 50%, policymakers should assess this drain on value creation across all six capitals (Kaiser et al, 2015). Evidence of the negative impacts of bad and/or abusive (ill-doing) leaders is discussed in the current leadership and public health literature (Rose et al, 2015). These value depleting ill-doing tendencies of bad leaders are contributing to high turnover, low discretionary effort and reduced goal achievement (Tepper et al, 2008). Underscoring the need to address this serious value depleting issue of bad leadership, is the irony that billions of dollars are being spent annually on leadership development (Gurdjian et al, 2014). The disconnect between leadership effectiveness and investment in leadership development seems to call on policymakers to work to reduce the adverse impacts of leader ill-doing while promoting more understanding around seeking well-doing oriented solutions. All leaders and organizations could benefit from enhancing their well-doing behaviors. It seems important for policymakers to better understand and help positively impact well-doing as a key outcome.

Practice Domain

In the context of executive coaching, I have developed a stepwise approach to managing well-doing as a specific adaptation of the proffered framework. This approach has been adapted and applied in numerous organizational settings with a variety of executives (Kerns, 2022b). Each of the steps is briefly reviewed below:

Step 1: Positioning Impacting Well-Doing

The initial step in the stepwise process is intended to serve as the "motivating preamble" to initiating a program to positively impact well-doing. The coach orients the client to this systematic interactive process and seeks to gain commitment for using the approach. Two important benefits of effective well-doing typically shared are that well-doing (a) contributes to enhancing value for stakeholders that subsequently generates value for owners/shareholders (Kempster, Maak & Parry, 2019) and (b) enhances both the well-doer's and the recipient's well-being (Aknin et al, 2018).

Step 2: Assessing – Prioritizing – Clarifying

Using appropriate assessment tools, (e.g., VIA- Values in Action Questionnaire, Well-Doing Virtuous Leading Checklist-WDVL-C and/or Lifespan Leadership Development Review Protocol), the executive coach facilitates clients in identifying, prioritizing and clarifying their virtuous values and virtue-oriented character strengths. Once identified, they can be clarified and practiced.

Step 3: Affirming – Understanding

After the virtuous values and aligned character strengths have been identified, prioritized and clarified, clients are asked to affirm that they accurately represent their virtuous values and character strengths. This is typically accomplished by asking clients to seek feedback from three to five trusted individuals who can assess the extent to which their identified virtuous values and character strengths are reflected in leadership behaviors. Clients are asked to identify three to five specific actions that they have proactively and intentionally taken in the last 90 days to help an individual, group/team and/or organization. They are also asked to describe how their actions positively impacted these recipients. Clients are facilitated in reflecting on the people, events and situations that helped shape and form their values. This process has proven to help clients affirm and more fully understand the nature of their core virtuous values and associated beliefs. Leaders are also facilitated in considering the level of self-serving behaviors they display in relationship to their well-doing actions. A number of tools have proven to be useful in stimulating reflection and fuller understandings around selfishness (Kerns, 2022b).

Step 4: Well-Doing Leader Identity Profiling

Building upon the client's affirmation and understanding of their virtuous values and character strengths, a client is guided in developing and documenting a well-doing leader identity profile. This profile consists of a virtuous value-character strength statement, a set of guiding principles, and related set of key behavioral practices that help operationalize the selected virtuous values and beliefs. In my experience and as reflected in the extant conceptual literature, well-doing identity profiles are unique constellations of virtues (Wright et al, 2021), meaning that virtuous leaders have their own unique well-doing identity profile. As part of this process, key stakeholders are identified as people with whom clients may practice their well-doing identity-based habits. These stakeholders are also called upon to provide feedback to clients regarding their well-doing behavior.

Step 5: Execute, Coach and Index Well-Doing Impacts

Using a self-coaching or executive coaching approach, clients are introduced to a virtuous leader well-doing management cycle and asked to regularly review and evaluate how effective they are in proactively and intentionally executing well-doing oriented behaviors which are aligned with their core virtuous values, beliefs and character strengths (Kerns, 2022b). Clients are encouraged to track how their well-doing behaviors are impacting well-being and other key performance indicators.

The above stepwise approach has proven useful in helping leaders identify, affirm, operationalize and index their effectiveness at executing well-doing. It has also been valuable in helping leaders strengthen their well-doing leader identities.

Research Domain

The focus of this article is on helping practitioners and policy makers positively impact well-doing as a process and key outcome in organizational settings. However, there are several areas in this emerging field of study and practice that seem important for applied oriented researchers to pursue. It would be of interest to investigate the behaviors which help positively impact well-doing. Identifying and better understanding these behaviors that are associated with the effective well-doing would, for example, likely help organizations in their efforts in recruiting, selecting and managing leaders who are dispositionally and/ behaviorally oriented toward well-doing. Identifying candidates with behavioral tendencies toward being proactively and authentically altruistic while displaying practical wisdom would be beneficial.

Research to investigate well-doing as an outcome measure would be helpful. In this regard, work to better assess and understand the relationship between performance, well-being and well-doing would be useful. For instance, investigating the spillover effects between these three foundational outcomes would be valuable for practitioners and policy makers who are working to impact these areas to better recognize and manage these dynamics. My current work and that of others seems to indicate that there is a reciprocal effect between well-doing and well-being (Titova & Sheldon, 2021). It appears, for example, that individuals who do things for the benefit of others will also experience enhanced well-being. In fact, neuroscientists have located areas of the brain that are positively activated by giving to others, inducing what has been described as a "helper's high" (Rath & Harter, 2010).

It would be helpful to better understand individual differences in leaders' selfishness tendencies and their propensity for engaging in well-doing behaviors and how these two areas interact. The theorizing and study of human morality holds selfishness as a key component. However, the psychological nature of this individual difference making factor, especially how it relates to constructs like well-doing, is substantially ignored. Carlson et al (2022) have recently addressed this discrepancy by offering a framework which looks more directly at the psychological nature of selfishness rather than expand upon the prior work relating to the evolutionary, economic and philosophical aspects of this psychological attribute. From this perspective, selfishness is seen as situation-specific desires that benefit the self and put other's desires and normative social expectations aside (Carlson, 2022). The ability to recognize and manage psychological selfishness in ourselves and others is important in establishing and maintaining effective interpersonal relationships. In my view, well-doing is influenced by leaders' capacities for self and situational awareness as it relates to detecting and managing situation specific instances of selfishness. In the context of the proffered well-doing leader practice–oriented framework, I am currently involved in field work to further explore the assessment of selfishness within executive teams and how this attribute influences well-doing behaviors and team effectiveness. As part of these efforts, I have developed a well-doing-selfishness matrix which is proving to be useful in helping leaders and their teams assess selfishness and gain additional insights regarding its relationship to individual and collective well-doing (Kerns, 2022b). This work relates to research concerning team altruism and selfish team member behavior (Li et al, 2014).

It is unclear in the extant literature what the relationship is between well-doing and ill-doing. Applied research in this area would be useful in helping better understand these dynamic relationships. For example, it would be especially useful to learn if leaders who are low in expressing well-doing behaviors are high in showing ill-doing tendencies. My experience and observations relating to the relationship between well-doing and ill-doing lead me to believe that these two constructs are not on the same continuum. However, future research would help clarify this and other related relationships. This line of inquiry connects with the prior discussion relating to selfishness and well-doing behaviors.

A closer empirical examination of how well-doing behaviors and related responsible leadership practices impact the six capitals would likely advance this field of study. In particular, the work connecting responsible leadership to key business outcomes and virtues needs to be extended to well-doing (Kempster et al, 2019; Wright et al, 2021). In addition to specific practices that influence well-doing, it would be

valuable to see more practitioner-oriented frameworks for understanding and executing well-doing management programs at work. Specifically, these frameworks could help bring additional definitional clarity and assessment focus to the study and practice of well-doing in organizational settings. Frameworks which connect responsible leadership and well-doing together with virtuousness need to be encouraged (Cameron, 2022; Shi & Ye, 2016).

Given the high incidence of incompetent, ineffective and abusive leadership, it seems important to better understand how well-doing leadership development programs can be designed to help remedy this unsettling circumstance. It would be particularly useful to have research conducted which helps identify the well-doing profiles of abusive leaders and compare them to authentic well-doing leaders. A related line of investigation concerning the development of additional assessment tools to measure character strength and virtuous behavior would be welcomed. Currently there is a need for more practitioner friendly assessment tools to advance the study and practice of well-doing.

Finally, individual differences likely play a role in leaders' capacities to positively impact well-doing. Individuals seem to vary in terms of the attributes and personality facets that may influence their propensity to be authentic well doers. For example, altruism is connected to one's tendency to be concerned about acting in ways that benefit others. Research which contributes in helping leaders set stretching altruistic goals and execute them is needed and would likely benefit practitioners who are striving to become effective well doers in their organizations (Lieder et al, 2022). Also, proactivity and intentionality are important areas which need to be explored more fully in regards to how they relate to well-doing at work (Parker et al, 2010). From a neuroscience point of view, a better understanding of areas such as these may help leaders and those coaching leaders to more actively use neuroscience-based interventions to help leaders impact levels of well-doing in organizations. It seems that the recent work in brain science and its application in organizational settings holds promise for practitioners who are interested in impacting the processes that help enhance well-doing (Zak, 2018). Conceptual as well as practitioner friendly empirical work would likely make valuable contributions in this area of study.

Teaching Domain

The teaching of leadership could be advanced by having practical frameworks and tools to offer emerging as well as experienced leaders seeking to enhance their effectiveness. I have imported some of the frameworks and tools used in organizational settings into my Executive MBA classrooms when facilitating the learning of frameworks and tools associated with positively impacting well-doing oriented behaviors.

The application of the well-doing related frameworks and tools offered in this article have been advanced by using experiential exercises in a business classroom setting. These applied activities help learners better understand and utilize these frameworks and tools. For example, a well-doing – selfishness matrix has been a useful framework in helping students better understand the relationship between authentic well-doing and self-serving behaviors. In this regard, students are asked to plot where they believe they fall on their level of well-doing compared to selfishness behaviors displayed at work. This experiential activity often facilitates discussions about the behaviors that are associated with being a well-doer. It also opens the door to discussions about the difference between self-interested motivation and transcendent motivation. Students report that they gain additional insights regarding the dynamics associated with well-doing and self-interested driven behaviors.

Having students take a number of different assessment tools relating to virtuous leadership values and character strengths has proven to be helpful. In particular, the VIA character strengths questionnaire (which can be taken online) has been a useful tool in helping students further understand and appreciate their character strengths. One activity as a follow up to completing the questionnaire is to have students interview one another and then have them report out how the character strength relates to the following three areas.

- How the character strengths have positively impacted some aspect of their life.
- How their top character strengths can be employed in building a well-doing identity.
- How their top character strengths may have been overused in ways that reduced their effectiveness as a well-doer.

An additional activity that has proven to be valuable is having students take their top five character strengths gleaned from their VIA and rate them using an excess rating scale (Kaiser & Overfield, 2010). This activity encourages additional self-awareness and appreciation for the over and under use of virtuous behaviors. As a follow up to this activity students are expected to read Kaplan and Kaiser's book, *Fear Your Strengths: What You Are Best at Could be Your Biggest Problem*, to further help them understand the importance of being situationally aware and wise when using their strengths at work (Kaplan & Kaiser, 2013).

An activity requiring students to identify specific people and situations where they can demonstrate well-doing behaviors at work has proven to be especially helpful. In this activity students are asked to develop a profile of three to five behaviors that they believe best relate to their identity as well-doers. Then they are challenged to apply this profile to individuals and situations at work in a proactive and intentional way. As a follow up, learners are asked to report back to the learning community regarding how their application went. These discussions have proven to be valuable in helping students learn from one another and to further develop their effective well-doing behaviors.

Another impactful and useful experiential activity involves students developing their well-doing identity as a leader (Kerns, 2022a). Students are asked to develop five bullet points which best describe them as a well-doer. These five areas are gleaned from the various assessment tools that they take during the class that relate to assessing virtue-oriented values and character strengths. Students have the opportunity to present their well-doing identity to the full class. This activity has facilitated meaningful exchanges between students and often finds others embellishing upon the identity areas presented. This feedback typically is supportive and encouraging and strengthens students' identities as well-doers. Throughout this process I encourage students to think of their well-doing identity as a muscle which needs to be exercised. We talk about the idea that they "vote" for their identity every day (Clear, 2018).

Another experiential activity that applies well-doing in the context of responsible leadership underscores how both responsible leadership and well-doing target the concerns of others and seeks to clarify who the stakeholder is and what is involved in being helpful, responsive and respectful (Maak & Pless, 2019; Kerns, 2000). This application can be facilitated in two ways. One approach has students break out into small groups during class to brainstorm and identify one to three things they can do at work to benefit a specific stakeholder in a manner that makes a value-added contribution. Each breakout group focuses on one of the six capitals. Subsequently, the student breakout groups return to the classroom to report on the well-doing actions that they intend to apply at work to a specific stakeholder. This activity helps to reinforce the notion that well-doing involves serving diverse stakeholder groups and is not only exclusively targeting shareholders. It also increases awareness of the different areas or capitals which can be positively impacted by well-doing.

A second way that this application can be facilitated is to have students identify an individual or stakeholder group at work who can benefit from action planning and execution around one or more of the six capitals previously noted. (For example, an executive committee member was approached and engaged in developing a performance profile for a CEO position (Kerns, 2001). After action planning and executing the plan, individual students report back to the full class on their experience in executing their action plan at work. As with the first approach, this option helps students strengthen their understanding of well-doing. It also demonstrates to the full class how responsible leadership and well-doing cut across multiple levels and can address the spectrum of individual stakeholders, teams, the entire organization and external groups. Typically, multilevel and diverse stakeholders are represented by students when they provide feedback on their experience.

SOME CHALLENGES

Applying the impacting well-doing leader framework in practice presents a number of challenges. Practical yet reliable and valid measurement approaches need to be developed to help practitioners assess well-doing in workplace settings (Ng & Tay, 2020; Ng et al, 2018). To support these efforts, work needs to be done to provide more definitional clarity to well-doing. Defining well-doing in observable behavioral

terms will be important to this effort. Practitioners need definitional clarity when endeavoring to translate well-doing into manageable behaviors. Well-doing, as treated in the current article, is connected to virtue and virtuousness which have been addressed from many different perspectives (Cameron, 2022; Fowers, 2014; Fowers et al, 2020).

Character strengths and their related behavioral manifestations seem to be sensitive to situations and situational context (Ng & Tay, 2020; Nucci, 2017). These circumstances challenge applied researchers as well as practitioners to determine which character strengths may be best optimized across specific situations. This challenge also relates to the measurement challenge since there is a need for situational judgment type assessments that are sensitive to the circumstances that leaders face when striving to do good for the benefit of others (Stemler & Sternberg, 2006; Wright et al, 2021). This challenge also points up the need for increased interdisciplinary collaboration regarding well-doing (Lieder et al, 2022). Practitioners and applied oriented scholars have a role to play in helping identify profiles of authentic well-doers and those of individuals who do not seem to align with the dispositional and/or behavioral attributes for effective well-doing. Also, the emerging field of brain science as it applies in workplace settings holds promise for helping practitioners more fully understand and optimize well-doing in workplace settings (O'Mara, 2018; Zak, 2018).

Boards of directors and shareholders need to be more fully informed about the value and benefits of well-doing. There is emerging evidence that positively impacting well-doing produces good or virtuous dividends which translate into both economic and human sustainability gains for companies (Cameron, 2022; Kempster, 2022). Policymakers are challenged to support investments in human capital in the form of leadership and organizational development activities that target well-doing as both a key process and desired outcome. This action would likely help in addressing the epidemic of bad leadership (Örtenblad, 2021). There may be a connection between the lack of well-doing and abusive ill-doing leadership behaviors. This intuitive observation highlights the need for more applied research to investigate well-doing dynamics in organizational settings.

Beyond the current framework, there is a need for additional practitioner-oriented frameworks that will help leaders and decision-makers better understand and apply well-doing. Developers of these additional frameworks are challenged to consider well-doing as both a process to positively impact and a key result to be achieved. Further, they are encouraged to examine the spillover effects of well-doing on well-being and performance. Well-doing likely positively impacts and contributes to optimizing performance. In the case of well-being, it is clear that high performance cannot be optimized without a threshold level of well-being (Kerns, 2018b).Well-doing helps underscore the notion that all results are not created equal (Kerns, 2005). Well-doing can likely support all stakeholders and organizations in striving to do the right thing.

Finally, there is a challenge for organizations and their leaders to view well-doing across organizational levels. Efforts to enhance well-doing need to be aligned throughout an organization and also externally with outside stakeholders. Well-doing is impacted by a number of important spheres of influence which need to be addressed and managed (Kerns, 2015c).

SUMMARY STATEMENT

The development and application of frameworks and tools to help leaders and policymakers more effectively understand and impact well-doing in workplace settings will be valuable in advancing the practice and study of leadership. As this work continues, there will be a need for definitional clarity, assessment tools and leadership-organizational development efforts to help leaders and policymakers better understand and wisely invest in efforts to enhance effective well-doing in their organizations. These and related efforts will likely advance our knowledge and understanding of how to best impact well-doing in organizational settings. Leader practices will be an integral part of these efforts. Policymakers as well as practitioners play key roles in impacting well-doing at work. Their strategic and timely actions will likely pay substantial virtuous dividends.

ENDNOTES

1. Over nearly four decades a debate comparing and contrasting management and leadership has taken place. In this article the terms leader, manager, managerial leader, management and leadership are used synonymously. For additional comment on the management – leadership debate refer to, Kerns, C. D. & Ko, K. (2014). Managerial leadership competencies: A practice – oriented action role framework. *International Leadership Journal*, 6(1), 82-99.

2. These five core dimensions are part of a system of managerial leadership which strives to provide practitioners, applied researchers and teachers with an integrated approach when reviewing and considering leadership. The system brings together a number of streams of leadership study and research that have been offered over the past hundred years. As part of this system a better understanding and management of well-doing as a process and outcome can help the practice, study and teaching of leadership while also benefitting policy makers. It is beyond the scope of the current presentation to comprehensively review and discuss the five dimensional system.

REFERENCES

Aguirre-Y-Luker, G.C., Hyman, M.R., & Shanahan, K.J. (2017). Measuring systems of virtue development. In A.J.G. Sison, G.R. Beaubout, & I. Ferrero (Eds.), *Handbook of Virtue Ethics in Business Management*. Amsterdam, Netherlands: Springer.

Aknin, L.B., Van de Vondervoort, J.W., & Hamlin, J.K. (2018). Positive feelings reward and promote prosocial behavior. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, *20*, 55–59. doi:10.106/j.copsyc.2017.08.017

Aldwin, C.M., Igarashi, H., & Levenson, M.R. (2019). Wisdom as self-transcendence. In R. Sternberg & J. Glück (Eds.), *Handbook of Wisdom* (pp. 122–143). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Amis, J., Barney, J., Mahoney, J.T., & Wang, H. (2020). Why we need a theory of stakeholder governance – and why this is a hard problem. *Academy of Management Review*, *45*(3), 499–503.

Cameron, K.S. (2022). Responsible leadership as virtuous leadership. In N.M. Pless & T. Maak (Eds.), *Responsible leadership* (2nd Ed., pp. 770–792). New York, NY: Routledge.

Carden, L., & Wood, W. (2018). Habit formation and change. *Current Opinion in Behavioral Sciences*, *20*, 117–122.

Carlson, R.W., Adkins, C., Crockett, M.J., & Clark, M.S. (2022). Psychological selfishness. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *17*(5), 1359–1380.

Chalofsky, N., & Cavallaro, E. (2019). To have lived well: Well-being and meaningful work. In R. Yeoman, C. Bailey, A. Madden, & M. Thompson (Eds.), *The oxford handbook of meaningful work* (pp. 100–113). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Chan, K.Y., & Drasgow, F. (2001). Toward a theory of individual differences and leadership: Understanding the motivation to lead. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *86*, 481–498.

Cianciolo, A.T., & Sternberg, R.J. (2018). Practical intelligence and tacit knowledge: An ecological view of expertise. In K.A. Erickson, R.R. Hoffman, A. Kozbelf, & A.M. Williams, (Eds.), *The Cambridge handbook of expertise and expert performance* (2nd Ed., pp. 770–792). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Cikaliuk, M., Erakovic, L., Jackson, B., Noonan, C., & Watson, S. (2022). *Responsible leadership in corporate governance: An integrative approach.* New York, NY: Routledge. https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003054191

Clear, J. (2018). *Atomic habits: An easy & proven way to build good habits & break bad ones*. New York, NY: Avery.

Doh, J.P., & Quigley, N.R. (2014). Responsible leadership and stakeholder management: Influence pathways and organizational outcomes. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, *28*(3). https://doi.org/10.5465/amp.2014.0013

Fowers, B.J. (2012). An Aristotelian framework for the human good. *Journal of Theoretical and Philosophical Psychology*, *32*(1), 10–23.

Fowers, B.J. (2014). Toward programmatic research on virtue assessments: Challenges and prospects. *Theory and Research in Education*, *12*(3), 309–328.

Fowers, B.J., Carroll, J.S., Leonhardt, N.D., & Cokelet, B. (2020). The emerging science of virtue. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *16*(1), 1–30.

Grant, A.M., Nurmohamed, S., Ashford, S.J., & Dekas, K. (2011). The performance implications of ambivalent initiative: The interplay of autonomous and controlled motivations. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, *116*(2), 241–251.

Gurdjian P., Halbeisen, T., & Lane, K. (2014). Why leadership-development programs fail. *McKinsey Quarterly*, pp. 1–8.

Hackett, R.D., & Wang, G. (2012). Virtues and leadership: An integrated conceptual framework found in Aristotelian and Confucian perspectives on virtues. *Management Decision*, *50*(5), 868–899.

Hannah, S.T., Woolfolk, R.L., & Lord, R.G. (2009). Leader self-structure: A framework for positive leadership. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, *30*, 269–290.

Hardré, P.L., & Reeve, J. (2009). Training corporate managers to adopt a more autonomy-supportive motivating style toward employees: An intervention study. *International Journal of Training and Development*, *13*(3), 165–184.

Harms, P.D., Crede, M., Tynan, M., Leon, M., & Jeung, W. (2017). Leadership and stress: A meta-analytic review. *Leadership Quarterly*, *28*, 178–194.

Harvey, A.G., Callaway, C.A., Zieve, G.G., Gumport, N.B., & Armstrong, C.C. (2021). Applying the science of habit formation to evidence-based psychological treatments for mental illness. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *17*(2), 1–18.

Hauser, M. (2006). *Moral minds: How nature designed our universal sense of right and wrong*. New York, NY: ECCO.

Hoff, D.F., & Burke, W.B. (2017). *Learning agility: The key to leader potential*. Tulsa, OK: Hogan Press.

Jaeger, B., & van Vugt, M. (2022). Psychological barriers to effective altruism: An evolutionary perspective. *Current Opinion in Psychology*, *44*, 130–134. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2021.09.008

Kaiser, R.B., & Overfield, D.V. (2010). Assessing flexible leadership as a mastery of opposites. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, *62*, 105–118.

Kaiser, R.B., LeBreton, J.M., & Hogan, J. (2015c). The dark side of personality and extreme leadership. *Applied Psychology: An International Review*, *64*(1), 55–92.

Kaplan, R.E. & Kaiser, R.B. (2013). *Fear your strengths: What you are best at could be your biggest problem*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

Kempster, S. (2022). Responsible leadership and societal purpose: Reframing the purpose of business as pursuing good dividends. In N.M. Pless, & T. Maak (Eds.), *Responsible leadership*. (2nd Edition, pp. 97–116). New York, NY: Routledge.

Kempster, S., Maak, T., & Parry, K. (2019). *Good dividends: Responsible leadership of business purpose*. New York, NY: Routledge.

Kerns, C.D. (2000). Serving each other on the inside: Proven method for improving internal customer service. *Graziadio Business Review*, *3*(2).

Kerns, C.D. (2001). The power of performance profiling: Eight good reasons to concentrate on results. *Graziadio Business Review*, *4*(1).

Kerns, C.D. (2003). Creating and sustaining an ethical workplace culture: The value-attitude-behavior chain. *Graziadio Business Review*, *6*(3).

Kerns, C.D. (2004). Strengthening value-centered leadership: What, why and how? *Graziadio Business Review*, *7*(2).

Kerns, C.D. (2005). Are all results created equal? Auditing organizational outcomes for quality. *Total Quality Management & Business Excellence*, *16*(7), 827–840.

Kerns, C.D. (2015a). Individual differences: A core leadership dimension. *International Leadership Journal*, *7*(1), 54–77.

Kerns, C.D. (2015b). Motivations to lead: A core leadership dimension. *Journal of Organizational Psychology*, *15*(1), 9–23.

Kerns, C.D. (2015c). Situational context: A core leadership dimension. *Journal of Leadership, Accountability and Ethics*, *12*(1), 11–24.

Kerns, C.D. (2016a). Decisive problem solving: A key leadership practice. *Journal of Management Policy and Practice*, *17*(2), 66–77.

Kerns, C.D. (2016b). High-impact communicating: A key leadership practice. *Journal of Applied Business and Economics*, *18*(5), 11–24.

Kerns, C.D. (2016c). *Core Values Profiling and Prioritizing Checklis*t. Unpublished raw data.

Kerns, C.D. (2017). Managing leader core values at work: A practice-oriented approach. *Journal of Leadership, Accountability and Ethics*, *14*(1), 11–21.

Kerns, C.D. (2018a). Impacting well-being at work: A key managerial leader action role. *Journal of Management Policy and Practice*, *19*(1), 73–91.

Kerns, C.D. (2018b). Leader life-span experience management: A practice oriented approach. *Journal of Applied Business and Economics*, *20*(8), 105–119.

Kerns, C.D. (2020a). Managing wisdom: A practice-oriented leadership framework. *Journal of Management Policy and Practice*, *21*(5), 9–27.

Kerns, C.D. (2020b). *Behavior-Flex Scale*. Unpublished raw data.

Kerns, C.D. (2021a). Bad leaders: Some realities, reasons and remedies. In A. Örtenblad (Ed.), *Debating bad leadership: Reasons and remedies* (pp. 219–237). Palgrave Macmillan: Cham, Switzerland.

Kerns, C.D. (2021b). *Well-doing Virtuous Leading Checklist*. Unpublished raw data.

Kerns, C.D. (2022a). Managing leader identity at work: A practice-oriented approach. *Journal of Leadership, Accountability and Ethics*, *19*(1), 1–20

Kerns, C.D. (2022b). *Leading well-doing: A practice-oriented approach*. [Manuscript in preparation]. Applied Behavioral Science, PGBS, Pepperdine University.

Kouzes, J.M., & Posner, B.Z. (2021). *Everyday people, extraordinary leadership: How to make a difference regardless of your title, role or authority*. Hoboken, NJ: John Wiley & Sons.

Li, N., Kirkman, B.L., & Porter, C.O.L.H. (2014). Toward a model of work team altruism. *Academy of Management Review*, *39*(4), 541–565.

Lieder, F., Prentice, M., & Corwin-Renner, E.R. (2022). An interdisciplinary synthesis of research on understanding and promoting well-doing. *Social and Personality Psychology Compass*, *16*(9), e12704. https://doi:10.1111/spc3.12704.

Little, B.R. (2014). Well-doing: Personal projects and the quality of lives. *Theory and Research in Education*, *12*(3), 329–346. https://doi.org/10.1177/2F1477878514545847

Liu, Z., Riggio, R.E., Reichard, R.J., & Walker, D.O.H. (2022). Everyday leadership: The construct, its validation, and developmental antecedents. *International Leadership Journal*, *14*(1), 3–35.

Maak, T., & Pless, N.M. (2019). Responsible leadership: Reconciling people, purpose, and profit. In S. Kempster, T. Maak, & K.W. Parry (Eds.), *Good dividends: Responsible leadership and business purpose* (pp. 30–36). New York, NY: Routledge.

Ng, V., & Tay, L. (2020). Lost in translation: The construct representation of character virtues. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, *15*(2), 309–326.

Ng, V., Tay, L., & Kuykendall, L. (2018). The development and validation of a measure of character: The CIVIC. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, *13*(4), 346–372.

Niemiec, R.M., & McGrath, R.E. (2019). *The power of character strengths: Appreciate and ignite your positive personality*. An Official Guide from the VIA Institute on Character.

Nucci, L. (2017). Character: A multifaceted developmental system. *Journal of Character Education*, *13*(1), 1–16.

O'Mara, S. (2018). *A brain for business – A brain for life: How insights from behavioural and brain science can change business and business practice for the better*. Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan.

O'Mara-Schimek, M., Guillén, M., & Bañón Gomis, A.J. (2015). Approaching virtuousness through organizational ethical quality: Toward a more corporate social responsibility. *Business Ethics: A European Review*, *24*(S2). https://doi.org/10.1111/beer.12102

Örtenblad, A. (2021). *Debating bad leadership: Reasons and remedies*. Cham, Switzerland: Palgrave Macmillan.

Parker, S.K., Bindl, U.K., & Strauss, K. (2010). Making things happen: A model of proactive motivation. *Journal of Management*, *36*(4), 827–856. DOI: 10.1177/0149206310363732

Peterson, C., & Seligman, M.E.P. (2004). *Character strengths and virtues: A handbook and classification.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Rath, T. (2020). *Life's great question: Discover how you contribute to the world*. Alexandria, VA: Silicon Guild Books.

Rath, T., & Harter, J. (2010). *Well-being: The five essential elements*. New York: NY: Gallup Press.

Riggio, R.E., Zhu, W., Reina, C., & Maroosis, J.A. (2010). Virtue-based measurement of ethical leadership: The leadership virtues questionnaire. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, *62*(4), 235–250.

Rokeach, M. (1973). *The nature of human values*. New York, NY: Free Press.

Rose, K., Shuck, B., Twyford, D., & Bergman, M. (2015). Skunked: An integrative review exploring the consequences of the dysfunctional leader and implications for those employees who work for them. *Human Resource Development Review*, *14*(1), 64–90.

Ryan, R.M., & Deci, E.L. (2017). *Self-determination theory: Basic psychological needs in motivation, development and wellness*. New York, NY: Guilford Press.

Seligman, M.E.P. (2002). *Authentic happiness: Using the new positive psychology to realize your potential for lasting fulfillment.* New York, NY: Free Press.

Sheldon, K.M. (2018). Understanding the good life: Eudaimonic living involves well-doing, not well-being. In J.P. Forgas, R.F. Baumaister, & Edition 1 (Eds.), *The social psychology of living well* (pp. 116–136). Routledge.

Sheldon, K.M., Corcoran, M., & Prentice, M. (2019). Pursuing eudaimonic functioning versus pursuing hedonic well-being: The first goal succeeds in its aim whereas the second does not. *Journal of Happiness Studies: An Interdisciplinary Forum on Subjective Well-Being*, *20*(3), 919–933.

Shi, Y., & Ye, M. (2016). Responsible leadership: Review and prospects. *American Journal of Industrial and Business Management*, *6*(8), 877–884.

Stemler, S.E., & Sternberg, R.J. (2006). Using situational judgment test to measure practical intelligence. In J.A. Weekley, & R.E. Ployhart (Eds.), *Situational judgment tests: Theory, measurement and application* (pp. 107–131). New York, NY: Taylor and Francis.

Tepper, B.J., Henle, C.A., Lambert, L.S., Giacaione, R.A., & Duffy, M.K. (2008). Abusive supervision and subordinates' organization deviance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, *93*(4), 731–732.

Titova, L., & Sheldon, K.M. (2021). Happiness comes from trying to make others feel good, rather than oneself. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*. doi: 10.1080/17439760.2021.1897867

Wang, G., & Hackett, R.D. (2016). Conceptualization and measurement of virtuous leadership: Doing well by doing good. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *137*, 321–345.

Wang, G., & Hackett, R.D. (2020). Virtues-centered moral identity: An identity-based explanation of the functioning of virtuous leadership. *The Leadership Quarterly*, *31*. doi:10.1016/j.leaqua.2020.101421

Wright, J.C., Warren, M.T., & Snow, N.E. (2021). *Understanding virtue: Theory and measurement.* New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Yar Hamidi, D. (2019). On value and value creation: Perspectives from board research and practice in SMEs. In J. Gabrielsson, Khlif, W., & Yamak, S. (Eds.), *Research handbook on boards of directors* (pp. 420–443). Cheltenham, United Kingdom: Edward Elgar.

Zak, P.J. (2018). The neuroscience of high-trust organizations. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, *70*(1), 45–58.