HARDY LEADERSHIP: A MODEL FOR LEADERSHIP DEVELOPMENT IN A GLOBAL SOCIETY

Jeffrey L. McClellan, Frostburg State University
jlmcclellan@frostburg.edu

ABSTRACT

This paper discusses the traditional leadership paradigm and the factors of social change that delimit its effectiveness. The impact these changes have on leadership are described and an argument is made for a transition to a character-centered leadership paradigm that allows leaders to function more effectively in a global, change-oriented society. The relevance of Hardiness training is then discussed as a model for character centered, holistic leadership development.

INTRODUCTION

From 1975 to 1986, Dr. Salvatore Maddi and a group of graduate students conducted a longitudinal study of 450 male and female managers who worked for Illinois Bell Telephone during one of the most devastating organizational upheavals of the 20th century, the deregulation and divestiture of AT&T. This landmark study provided tremendous insights about how people respond to high stress environments. While two-thirds of the managers studied found themselves debilitated by the high stress environment, the remaining one third "not only survived, but actually thrived" (Khoshaba & Maddi, 2003, p. 13). As a result of this study, Maddi and his colleagues were able to identify the characteristics and behaviors that permitted these individuals to perform successfully in such a high stress environment. These characteristics came to be known as Hardiness.

As part of the original study, Maddi and his colleagues were asked to develop a program for training employees to become hardier. As a result, the Hardiness training program for stress management was developed. Since its inception, this program has helped thousands of individuals achieve similar success amidst stress. Additionally, the Hardiness concept and training program have proven their validity through research studies in the military (P. Bartone, Bartone, Kelly, & Matthews, 2013; Johnsen, Eid, Pallesen, Bartone, & Nissestad, 2009; Westman, 1990), education (Maddi, Khoshaba, Jensen, Carter, Lu, & Harvey2001), and business (Maddi & Kobasa1984; Steinhardt, Dolbier, Gottlieb, & McCallister2003). In the last few years, however, Hardiness training has, as a result of major societal changes that took place around the turn of the century, expanded its utility beyond the realm of stress management and become more increasingly relevant as a model for holistic leadership development that transcends the traditional model of leadership. This paper discusses the traditional leadership paradigm and the factors of social change that delimit its effectiveness. The impact these changes have on leadership are described and an argument is made for a transition to a character-centered, holistic leadership development.

TRADITIONAL LEADERSHIP

Traditional leadership within organizations has focused on what the leader does in order to get things done (Lussier & Achua, 2007). This model of leadership argues that effective leadership involves acquiring the skills, whether technical, conceptual, or human (Northouse, 2012), necessary to get one's followers to perform in such a way that the organization's goals and objectives are accomplished. While this model of leadership may use more democratic, enlightened methodologies for accomplishing goals, in reality such methods are generally incorporated as a means to an end, and are often pushed aside when they do not meet the immediate needs of the moment, or when the leader becomes sufficiently stressed. Consequently, the primary tactics of traditional leaders are command and control (Partridge, 2018).

Whatever tactics are used, the focus of traditional leadership remains on the leader's skills. Covey (1989) refers to this paradigm of leadership as the personality ethic, which argues that success is "more a function of personality, of public image, of attitudes and behaviors, skills and techniques, that lubricate the process of human interaction" (p. 19). At its best, this style of leadership accomplishes results. At its worst, however, it is "clearly manipulative, even deceptive, encouraging people to use techniques to get other people to like them" and to follow them (p. 19).

Because of the emphasis the traditional leadership model places on skills, its related development programs tend to focus solely on training leaders to utilize the traditional skills necessary to get things done. As Northouse (2004) explained, "The skills approach [to leadership development] provides a structure that is very consistent with the curricula of most leadership education programs . . . . [that] have traditionally taught classes in problem solving, conflict resolution, listening, and team work" as well as other leadership skill sets (p. 51). While all of these skills are important, simply understanding and using them within the construct of the traditional leadership model is becoming less and less effective. Recent societal changes have altered and are altering our world so drastically that old models of leadership, and consequently leadership development, are no longer effective.

OUR CHANGED WORLD

At the end of the 20th century, a number of fundamental changes took place that altered the world of work dramatically and created a context were resilience and hardiness is even more important for leaders than ever before. At the time, Work (1996) described the changing nature of our global environment in the following way:

The world as we have known it is changing at a dizzying pace, fueled by advances in technology and innovation. People are crisscrossing the planet in numbers not imagined even fifty years ago, demands for consumer goods and services and capital goods are soaring worldwide, and corporations, not-for-profit organizations, and other institutions are finding and developing new and significantly profitable markets beyond regional and national borders. At the core of this emerging global economy is a computer-driven information and communications technology that serves to under-gird and link the world's production and consumption capacities and needs. (p. 76)

As Work (1996) also explained, a number of social forces were driving rapid, revolutionary changes that altered both our work and personal lives. These forces included the rise of the global economy (Jarvis, 2000; McNair, 2001; Merricks, 2001), the emergence of the information society (Jarvis; McNair; Merricks), the changing nature of the workplace (Adams, October 1998; Bridges, 1996; Khoshaba & Maddi, 2003; Vanscoy, July 2000), technology (Jarvis; McNair) and shifting demographics (Adams; Bridges; McNair; Vanscoy; Work).

The term global economy refers to "the process whereby world wide economic forces supplant those of nation and locality" (McNair, 2001, p. 16). This process began as a result of increased international competition and expanded as resource scarcity increased (i.e. during the oil crisis). This led major corporations to seek cheaper manufacturing sites internationally (Jarvis, 2000), which further increased global competition. Since then, globalization has accelerated due to communication and transportation technology, global political restructuring, and the apparent dominance of capitalism as an economic philosophy. As a result of its emergence, the global economy has impacted organizations and leaders by increasing competition and diversity (Jarvis, 2000).

An information society is one in which most economic value is "generated by trade in knowledge, rather than in manufactured goods" (McNair, 2001p. 18). Due to the fact that "more and more work is knowledge-based rather than industrial," the rise of an information society, largely dependent upon knowledge workers, fundamentally altered the workplace (Bridges, 1996). Because knowledge workers tend to be more educated than employees of the past, are more likely to want to participate in the workplace. They are, therefore, less likely to appreciate traditional command and control leadership because they are capable of and expect greater autonomy and involvement. As Vanscoy (July 2000) declared, "they'll sooner weather the risks of unemployment than knuckle under to outmoded thinking" that restricts their freedom (p. 92). Furthermore, as part of their education, knowledge workers have often been taught the "techniques" of leadership and become resentful when these are used insincerely to "motivate" them.

Closely allied with the changing economy and the rise of the information society was the altered state of the workplace. As Khoshabba and Maddi (2003) explained, "Businesses now favor smaller, more rapidly changing work units over larger sized corporations" (p. 12). These smaller, more flexible organizations offered and continue to offer less security for employees than did the large corporations of the past because they are involved in mergers and acquisitions and

"expand, contract or shift direction more frequently . . . in response to ever-changing customer demands" (Adams, 1998, p. 9). Hence, "we can no longer expect to only work for one employer" (p. 12). In fact, Bridges (1996) went so far as to indicate that in the future organizations will become "de-jobbed" as they constantly alter the composition of their workforce to meet changing demands, a prediction that in some ways had occurred. Thus, as jobs have become and continue to become more transitory and smaller and more responsive organizations become more common, the workplace becomes less stable and more impersonal.

Another significant force for change was the increased rate of technological advancements (Jarvis, 2000; McNair, 2001). The rise of a global economy and a technology-based information society created a need for companies to achieve competitive advantage by staying one step ahead of their competitor's technology. This need involved increasing investments in research and development. With so much money at stake in a highly competitive environment, anxiety, fear, distrust, and other negative emotions have come to challenge the ability of leaders to act in accordance with the effective leadership skills they have been taught. Furthermore, technological advancements have led to technology disruptions. As (El Namaki, 2017) explained,

> Disruption is a radical change in the task or distant environments of an organization or a framework. It is triggered by disruptive forces or breakthroughs that alter current status in a tangible and measurable way. Disruption could be as fast and complete as to destroy existing markets, businesses and technologies and it could be as partial and progressive as to carve out a rapid incremental transformation. Disruptive forces leave a permanent imprint that compels a shift in products, processes and business models to what we may term the "new normal" (p. 74)

Thus, technology has driven change in ways that significantly altered the landscape of business by increasing instability and demanding rapid change.

In addition, "dramatically increasing numbers of women [have been] entering the work force in roles they would have been precluded from playing just a few decades ago" (Work, 1996, p. 77). As they have done so, they have brought with them a different way of leading and being led (Northouse, 2012). The same is true for the ethnic groups currently increasing their involvement in the workplace (Bordas, 2007, 2013; Northouse, 2012). As Work explained, "the ethnic, cultural, and gender characteristics of America's population and labor force are rapidly changing" (p. 77). New immigration patterns, combined with more traditional ones, are drastically altering the "face" of the work force. In fact, "it is estimated that nonwhite ethnic and cultural groups will exceed one-third of all new entrants to the labor force between now and the turn of the century" (p. 77). Once again, these trends have only continued since then.

These changes in the economy and the workplace have put tremendous pressure on all employees, especially leaders, to engage in ongoing learning, development, and change. McNair (2001) explained that workers, "need more sophisticated technical skills, [which] are rapidly changing, often in unpredictable ways" (p. 21). He further asserted that, "to cope in this world, individuals will need increasing skills in self-management, to be good at anticipating and responding to change, and perhaps above all to be good learners" (p. 23). Consequently, ongoing learning is essential

(Jarvis, 2001; Jupp, 2002; McNair, 2001; Senge, 1990). As Knowles, Holton, and Swanson (1998) further stated,

> A person's job security is increasingly dependent on an ability to grow and learn, sometimes in rather radical ways. Adults today are often faced with demands to learn and relearn their jobs multiple times in a career. Those who do not have strong learning skills usually face layoffs. (p. 169)

Jarvis and Tosey (2001) argued that employees and leaders would need the following skills in the changing economy "learning to learn, communication and collaboration, creative thinking and problem solving, technological literacy, global business literacy, leadership, career self-management" (p. 154). Current efforts to develop badging initiatives in higher education (Fain, 2016).

These changes and demands have also significantly increased individual stress levels, particularly in the case of leaders who are already burdened by high stress. As numerous authors have explained, leadership roles have always existed within a high stress context (Fassel, 1998; Lambert, Lambert, & Yamase2003; Quinn, 1996; Sturnick, 1998). This is true both in the business arena as well as in health care, public service, politics, and education (Stieglitz, 1998; Wilde, Ebbers, Shelley, & Gmelch2003). As a result, burnout, health problems, and emotional turmoil appear common among leaders (Lambert et al.; Stieglitz; Sturnick).

Sources of this turmoil include lack of supervisory support (Steinhardt et al., 2003), role ambiguity (Khoshaba & Maddi, 2003), constant scrutiny (Goleman, Boyatzis, & McKee, 2002), and information overload combined with mental fatigue (Restak, 2001; Smith, Winter 2002). Unfortunately, however, the abundance of information leaders receive does not necessarily make it easier for them to access the right information, which can also be stressful (Goleman, Boyatzis, & McKee2002). Finally, Clark and Cooper (2000) delineated all of the following factors as contributors to occupational stress for leaders: "role in the organization; relationships at work; career development; . . . home/work interface; [and] . . . the structure and climate of the organization (such as the management style, level of consultation, communication and politics)" (p. 174).

All of these stressors have a strong negative impact on leadership and personal effectiveness in a variety of ways. These negative effects include, but are not limited to, diminished job satisfaction (Steinhardt et al., 2003), illness (Goleman, 1995; Khoshaba & Maddi, 2003), cultural contamination through emotional contagion (Goleman et al., 2002; Lansisalmi, Peiro, & Kivimaki, 2000), hampered learning capacity and memory (Howard, 2000; Jensen, 1998; LeDoux, 1996; Restak, 2001), psychological disorders such as panic attacks and depression (Goleman; Restak), and performance (Westman, 1990). As Khoshabba and Maddi (2003) explained, "as daily stress rises, we tend to perform poorly, mentally burn out, get ill more frequently, and in the extreme, behave more aggressively" (p. 12). These symptoms of leadership burnout are merely augmented by the dramatic social changes previously delineated.

As forces for change accelerate and workplace stress increases, it becomes harder and harder to simply use "techniques" of leadership, which may have worked in the past, to accomplish

organizational goals. Quinn (1996) explained, "There are people who know how to lead, . . . yet they cannot bring themselves to initiate the process. There is no energy left. They are victims of burnout" (p. 20). In such situations, leaders cannot depend solely on their skills to succeed. They must achieve a higher level of leadership capacity that incorporates not only what the leader does, but who the leader is. Quinn argued, "To turn this situation around, for the healing process to begin, people must engage in deep personal change" (p. 21). Given this need, skill-based leadership development programs are no longer sufficient. What is needed is a leadership program that provides a process for supporting and engaging in deep, holistic personal change while also providing training in character-based leadership skills.

CHARACTER CENTERED LEADERSHIP

Hardiness as a training program is based on the idea that personal effectiveness is dependent on nourishing and developing the whole self. This philosophy of development is closely aligned with Covey's (1989) "Character Ethic" paradigm. He explained, "The Character Ethic [teaches] that there are basic principles of effective living, and that people can only experience true success and enduring happiness as they learn to integrate these principles into their basic character" (p. 18). The essence of this type of leadership is fundamentally different than that of the paradigm of traditional leadership. Quinn (2004) explained,

becoming a leader is not a matter of becoming adept at a certain set of 'behaviors' or learning a particular set of leadership 'principles' or 'tools.' Behaviors, principles, and tools all have their place, but they will not make transformational leaders of us without a process of deep inner change. (p. 195)

Leadership education, therefore, must not only provide skill enhancement, but also identity development. Instead of focusing on teaching leaders to use whatever technique is necessary to get the results he or she desires, leadership development training programs must focus on fostering integrity by "creating a seamless link between [a leader's] espoused values, actions, and behaviors" (Luthans & Avolio, 2003, p. 242). Such alignment is essential because, as Zenger and Folkman (2002) declared, "Personal character is the core of all leadership effectiveness. . . . ethical standards, integrity, and authenticity are extremely important" (p. 13). Where these are lacking, leaders lose much of their credibility and influence with those they lead.

Unfortunately, however, this kind of leadership requires tremendous energy, which is typically in short supply when individuals are facing the high stress levels of today's workplace. As a result, it is imperative that leadership development programs also engage and educate leaders in a process of holistic personal growth that will allow them to function effectively within the context of today's global, change-oriented society.

HARDY LEADERSHIP

The Hardiness training program facilitates this process of character-centered leadership education by assisting leaders to develop internal qualities as well as behavioral skills integrated into the identity of the leader. As a result, leaders not only alter their behaviors, but also their identity, thereby ensuring that they can thrive in high-stress environments.

The internal principles upon which Hardiness is founded, and which must be integrated into one's basic character to overcome stress and increase leadership effectiveness, are commitment, control, and challenge. Maddi (2004) recently defined these characteristics in the following terms,

> If you are strong in commitment, you want to stay involved with the people and events going on around you, as that seems the best way to find what is experientially interesting and meaningful. It seems wasteful to you to sink into isolation and alienation. If you are strong in control, you want to struggle to have an influence on the outcomes going on around you, even if this may seem difficult in certain circumstances. It seems wasteful to you to sink into powerlessness and passivity. Furthermore, if you are strong in challenge, you find the process of continuing to learn from your experiences. (p. 286)

Each of these characteristics represents an essential attribute leaders must possess to operate effectively in high stress environments.

Commitment

Leaders who are high in commitment view their "work as important and worthwhile enough to warrant [their] full attention, imagination and effort" (Maddi & Khoshaba2005, p. 18). As a result, they "stay involved with the events and people around [them] even when the going gets rough" (p. 18). This is typically because they have a strong sense of purpose and vision, and are passionately engaged in what they are doing. In terms of leadership, a hardy leader would be one who "is actively engaged in the work as well as the people doing the work." (P. T. Bartone, Eid, Johnsen, Laberg, & Snook, 2006, p. 502). It is not surprising, therefore, that numerous leadership experts have documented the value of commitment and its underlying variables of visionary leadership, passionate engagement, and purpose-centered behavior (Batten, 1998; Covey, 1989; Goleman et al., 2002; Northouse, 2004; Quinn, 1996, 2004; Wheatley, 1999). In addition, connections have been made to the role of commitment in achieving flow, intrinsic motivation, and heroic and courageous leadership (Lloyd & Atella, 2000).

Control

Maddi and Khoshaba (2005) described leaders who possess a strong sense of control as "trying to positively influence the outcomes of the changes going on around [them]" (p. 18) because they

believe in their capacity to act within their sphere of influence in order to bring about positive change in their environment, they are able to face difficult challenges as they arise. Covey (1989) described this as operating within one's circle of influence in order to address one's circle of concern. This proactive response to life is an essential element of leadership that is based upon a leader's locus of control, confidence and self-efficacy, and personal mastery—all of which have been identified as critical elements of leadership and resilience (Benard, 2004; Goleman et al., 2002; Lloyd & Atella, 2000; Luthans & Avolio, 2003; Northouse, 2004; Quinn, 2004; Senge, 1990; Sutcliffe & Vogus, 2003). In addition, Lloyd and Atella (2000) discuss how control can be contrasted with over-control, which could likely explain differences in autocratic vs. empowering approaches to leadership. They also address the connection between control and leader responsibility. Thus, leaders who demonstrate a control orientation would be "confident and planful in pursuing tasks and goals" (P. T. Bartone et al., 2006, p. 502).

Challenge

The concept of challenge refers to the attitude a leader possesses that leads him or her to "face up to stressful changes, try to understand them, and solve them" (Maddi & Khoshaba2005, p. 18). Such individuals are not afraid to face difficult challenges or to take risks because they humbly recognize and accept that "the social systems necessary to solve modern problems are inherently complex. . . . [and] it is impossible to anticipate all possible events and effects, so failure or accident is inevitable" (Stone, 2002*, p. 195*). As leaders, these individuals would not be "deterred by obstacles and setbacks, but instead interpret these as challenges to overcome and to learn from" (P. T. Bartone et al., 2006, p. 502). Because they know that failure is simply a mechanism that facilitates their learning and growth, they would view "novel situations that test one's abilities" as "fun" (P. T. Bartone et al., 2006, p. 502). Lloyd and Atella (2000) suggest a connection between this and a leaders ability to demonstrate authenticity and courage and the practice of activist social support.

These three character traits: commitment, control, and challenge, under-gird the Hardiness training program, and make it possible for individuals to engage in the deep personal change that can "only occur when people take active control of their lives," in spite of the challenges they face (Quinn, 1996, p. 21).

Regarding the interplay of these three traits, Maddi (2004) stated, "Conceptually, not one of the 3 *C*s by itself is enough to provide the needed courage and motivation to turn stressful changes to advantage. What is needed is all three of the *C*s operating together" (p. 287). When combined, these attitudinal elements facilitate the reframing of challenges in positive ways so as to better deal with them. This allows leaders to see themselves, others, and their environment in a more positive, involved, caring way that fosters greater spiritual, mental, and emotional health. These characteristics and behaviors likely contribute to the ability to respond to the needs of followers outlined by Rath and Conchie (2008): trust, hope, security. and compassion In addition, commitment, control, and challenge also impact one's ability to engage in the relational and behavioral aspects of hardiness: social support and healthful living. Both of these areas of personal effectiveness are critical components of effective leadership.

Social Support

Social support encompasses the fostering of and use of positive social relationships to assist individuals in overcoming challenges. It also deals with conflict resolution (Khoshaba & Maddi, 2003). Grounded in the principles of commitment, control, and challenge, these social support processes are founded on the idea that oneself and those with whom he or she relates are worthwhile and capable of growth and change. As leaders interrelate with others based on these principles and act in service to their relationships, they become more effective at managing conflict, communicating whole messages, monitoring and managing their learned ideas and emotional triggers, and giving and receiving both assistance and encouragement, while avoiding overprotection and subtle competition (Khoshaba & Maddi). These principles and skills are taught as part of the Hardiness training program and represent essential components of emotionally intelligent leadership (Goleman et al., 2002). In fact, virtually all leadership experts identify relational skills (conflict resolution, effective communication, etc.) or relationships in general as critically essential elements of effective leadership (Covey, 1989; Goleman et al., 2002; Greenleaf, 1998; Luthans & Avolio, 2003; Northouse, 2004; Palmer, 1998; Quinn, 2004; Spears, 1998; Wheatley, 1999; Zenger & Folkman, 2002). Furthermore, the development of relational skills and the existence of strong supportive relationships are particularly important when leaders are striving to function in high stress environments (Benard, 2004; Higgins, 1994; Maddi2004; Maddi & Khoshaba2005; Reivich & Shatte, 2002).

In spite of the emphasis Hardiness places on skill development, it is important to reiterate that simple possession of interpersonal skills is not what makes an effective leader; because it is not simply what the leader does, or how he or she does it, that nurtures strong relationships, but rather "how the person is regarding us when doing these things" (Institute, 2000, p. 24). Thus while skills are necessary to develop and maintain strong supportive relationships, character is essential for leaders who hope to sustain the supportive relationships necessary to insure success amid stress.

Healthful Living

Healthful living practices, which Maddi (2004) refers to as "self-care," include "relaxation, nutrition, and physical activity" and represent a critical element of Hardiness training (p. 294). Maddi explained,

The aim of this self-care regimen is to provide and maintain optimal arousal for doing the work of effective coping and social support interaction regardless of whatever stressful circumstances are going on. This . . . is a way of keeping the anxiety associated with change within tolerable limits. (p. 294)

Although little research and writing has addressed the role of physical health practices in relation to leadership development, anecdotal discussion of its importance is not uncommon (Covey, 1989, p. 289-292; Murrell, 2003, p. 107). At the same time, significant research has demonstrated that a

healthy, relaxed body is more energetic and alert and less debilitated by fatigue, moodiness, attention difficulties, and mental, physical, learning, and psychological disabilities and illnesses (Khoshaba & Maddi, 2003). These negative effects, once exaggerated by high stress environments, could significantly delimit leadership effectiveness. Thus while in the past many leaders have performed successfully in spite of a failure to live healthfully, these individuals could not and will not be able to achieve their full potential as leaders while continuing to neglect their physical health in the increasingly fast-paced, change oriented, globally competitive society of the future. Fortunately, Hardiness training provides a model for addressing this component of leadership effectiveness as part of its holistic approach to individual and leadership development.

HARDINESS AND LEADERSHIP

Clearly, the Hardiness model has a lot to contribute to the development of individuals as leaders. However, this assertion is more than just theoretical. Indeed, some important research has been done to examine and apply the principles of hardiness to the practices of leadership and leadership development.

The connection between leadership and hardiness goes back to the original research study upon which the concept was built (Maddi & Kobasa, 1984). Indeed, the original study was focused on studying what allowed mid-level managers and executives to achieve success in their work, including their leadership, in spite of stressful challenges. As Lloyd and Atella attest, "A vision of leadership, with broadened horizons for a new millennium, can become better defined through visionary thinking. This stream of thought . . . flows back to the research on the hardy executive"(p. 156). Indeed, they suggest that, with its emphasis on resiliency, the original hardiness research represents an early effort to study positive leadership. Given the foundation of hardiness in existential philosophy and its emphasis on meaning, the connection with visionary leadership is significant.

Since then some additional studies have been conducted to more directly explore the connection between hardiness and leadership. Building upon the work of McClellan (2013), which identified both theoretical similarities and a statistical relationship between servant leadership and psychological hardiness, Popa (2012) applied the concepts of hardiness and servant leadership to the design of a engaged learning course that placed students in the role.

In their study of leadership among military cadets at West Point, P. T. Bartone et al. (2006) sought to determine the extent to which personality factors predicted leader performance in academic and field experiences. In their study, they found that hardiness was the "strongest predictor of leader performance, and the only personality factor predicting leader performance across the two different contexts" (p. 512). In a similar study with naval Cadets, Eid et al. (2009) examined the impact of hardiness on leadership styles. Their results suggested that "personality hardiness—especially hardiness challenge—as a personality dimension that may be an important developmental precursor for positive leadership styles. Another similar study found that Hardiness predicted adaptability among graduates of West Point once they graduated (P. Bartone et al., 2013). Finally, P. T. Bartone (2006) identified ways in which leaders might promote the hardiness of followers using a case study approach.

CONCLUSION

Our society has changed dramatically. The economy, the market place, the workforce, our communities, and our work environment and tools all evolved dramatically at the turn of the century as a result of the forces of globalization. If leaders are going to remain effective in this altered society, they must engage in co-evolutionary processes. Traditional leadership models and techniques will no longer bring about the success they did in the past. Even if effective methods are used within the paradigm of traditional leadership, the high stress context of today's global society and workplace makes it difficult, if not impossible, for leaders to act appropriately when they are not grounded to solid principles. The Hardiness model not only provides such principles, commitment, control, and challenges, it also offers a methodology for developing and internalizing them. Additionally, it advocates for a holistic strategy of personal development that helps leaders to improve their physical, emotional, mental, spiritual, and social well-being and effectiveness. In so doing, leaders develop greater resistance to stress and improve their leadership capacity, not to mention learning new leadership skills. Hence, the emerging concept of Hardy leadership development, because of its relevance in a global, change-oriented society, may well prove to be the greatest outgrowth of the original Hardiness studies thus far.

REFERENCES

Adams, M. (October 1998). The stream of labor slows to a trickle. *HRMagazine.* Retrieved from http://www.shrm.org/hrmagazine/articles/1098cov.htm

Bartone, P., Bartone, P. T., Kelly, D. R., & Matthews, M. D. (2013). Psychological Hardiness predicts adaptability in military leaders: A prospective study. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment, 21*(2), 200-210.

Bartone, P. T. (2006). Resilience under military operational stress: Can leaders influence hardiness? *Military Psychology, 18*(3), S131-S148.

Bartone, P. T., Eid, J., Johnsen, B. H., Laberg, J. C., & Snook, S. (2006). Big five personality factors, hardinessm and social judgment as predictors of leader performance. *Leadership and Organizational Development Journal, 30*(6), 498-521.

Batten, J. (1998). Servant leadership: A passion to serve. In L. C. Spears (Ed.), *Insights on leadership: Service, stewardship, and servant leadership* (pp. 38-53). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Benard, B. (2004). *Resilience: What we have learned*. San Francisco: WestEd.

Bordas, J. (2007). *Salsa, soul, and spirit: Leadership for a multicultural age* (1st ed.). San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

Bordas, J. (2013). *The power of latino leadership: Culture, inclusion, and contribution*. San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

Bridges, W. (1996). Leading the de-jobbed organization. In F. Hesselbein, M. Goldsmith, & R. Beckhard (Eds.), *The leader of the future* (pp. 11-18). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Clark, S. G., & Cooper, C. L. (2000). The risk management of occupational stress. *Health, Risk, and Society, 2*(2), 173-187.

Covey, S. R. (1989). *The seven habits of highly effective people*. New York: Simon and Schuster.

Eid, J., Bartone, P., Johnsen, B. H., Eid, J., Pallesen, S., Bartone, P. T., & Nissestad, O. A. (2009). Predicting transformational leadership in naval cadets: Effects of personality hardiness and training. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 39*(2213-2235).

El Namaki, M. S. S. (2017). Neo-globalization: Premises, processes and the future. *Scholedge International Journal of Business Policy & Governance, 4*(7), 71-77. doi:10.19085/journal.sijbpg040701

Fain, P. (2016). Digital, Verified and Less Open. *Inside Higher Ed.* Retrieved from https://www.insidehighered.com/news/2016/08/09/digital-badging-spreads-more-colleges-use-vendors-create-alternative-credentials

Fassel, D. (1998). Lives in the balance: The challenge of servant-leaders in a workaholic society. In L. Spears (Ed.), *Insights on leadership: Service, stewardship, and servant leadership.* (pp. *216-245*). NewYork: John Wiley & Sons.

Goleman, D. (1995). *Emotional intelligence: Why it can matter more than IQ*. New York: Bantam Books.

Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R., & McKee, A. (2002). *Primal leadership*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School Press.

Greenleaf, R. K. (1998). Servant Leadership. In L. Spears (Ed.), *Insights on leadership: Service, stewardship, and servant leadership.* (pp. 15-20). New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Higgins, G. O. C. (1994). *Resilient adults: Overcoming a cruel past*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Howard, P. J. (2000). *The owner's manual for the brain: Everyday applications from mind-brain research*. Austin, TX: Bard Press.

Institute, T. A. (2000). *Leadership and self-deception: Getting out of the box*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers, Inc.

Jarvis, P. (2000). Globalization, the learning society and comparative education. *Comparative Education, 36*(3), 343-355.

Jarvis, P. (2001). Questioning the learning society. In P. Jarvis (Ed.), *The age of learning: education and the knowledge society* (pp. 16-26). London, UK: Kogan Page.

Jarvis, P., & Tosey, P. (2001). Corporations and professions. In P. Jarvis (Ed.), *The age of learning: Education and the knowledge society* (pp. 147-156). London, UK: Kogan Page.

Jensen, E. (1998). *Teaching with the brain in mind*. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Johnsen, B. H., Eid, J., Pallesen, S., Bartone, P. T., & Nissestad, O. A. (2009). Predicting transformational leadership in naval cadets: Effects of personality hardiness and training. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 39*(9), 2213-2235. doi:10.1111/j.1559-1816.2009.00522.x

Jupp, R. (2002). Creating a learning society *Education Review, 15*(2), 62-65.

Khoshaba, D. M., & Maddi, S. R. (2003). *HardiTraining: Volume 1* (4 ed.). New Port Beach: CA: The Hardiness Institute, Inc..

Knowles, M. S., Holton III, E. F., & Swanson, R. A. (1998). *The adult learner* (5 ed.). Woburn, MA: Butterworth-Heineman.

Lambert, V. A., Lambert, C. E., & Yamase, H. (2003). Psychological hardiness: Workplace stress and related stress reduction strategies. *Nursing & Health Sciences, 5*(2), 181-184.

Lansisalmi, H., Peiro, J. M., & Kivimaki, M. (2000). Collective stress and coping in the context of organizational culture. *European Journal of Work and Organizational Psychology, 9*(4), 527-559.

LeDoux, J. E. (1996). *The emotional brain: The mysterious underpinnings*. New York: Touchstone Book.

Lloyd, P. J., & Atella, M. D. (2000). Positive leadership that inspires: Theoretical and empirical perspectives from positive psychology, existential theory, and hardiness research. *The Psychologist-Manager Journal, 4*(2), 155-165. doi:10.1037/h0095889

Lussier, R. N., & Achua, C. F. (2007). *Leadership: Theory, application, skill development* (4 ed.). Mason, Ohio: Thomson/SouthWestern.

Luthans, F., & Avolio, B. (2003). Authentic Leadership Development. In K. S. Cameron, R. E. Quinn, & J. E. Dutton (Eds.), *Positive organizational scholarship: Foundations of a new discipline* (pp. 241-261). San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Maddi, S. R. (2004). Hardiness: An operationalization of existential courage. *Journal of Humanistic Psychology, 44*(3), 279-298.

Maddi, S. R., & Khoshaba, D. M. (2005). *Resilience at work: How to succeed no matter what life throws at you*. San Francisco: AMACOM.

Maddi, S. R., Khoshaba, D. M., Jensen, K., Carter, E., Lu, J. L., & Harvey, R. H. (2001). Hardiness training for high-risk undergraduates. . *NACADA Journal, 22*(1), 45-55.

Maddi, S. R., & Kobasa, S. C. (1984). *The hardy executive: Health under stress*. Homewood, IL: Dow Jones-Irwin.

McClellan, J. L. (2013). Servant leadership and psychological hardiness. *International Journal of Servant Leadership, 9*(1), 107-129.

McNair, S. (2001). Social, economic, and political contexts. In P. Jarvis (Ed.), *The age of learning: education and the knowledge society* (pp. 16-26). London, UK: Kogan Page.

Merricks, L. (2001). The emerging idea. In P. Jarvis (Ed.), *The age of learning: education and the knowledge society* (pp. 3-15). London, UK: Kogan Page.

Murrell, K. L. (2003). International and intellectual roots of appreciative inquiry. In D. L. Cooperrider, P. F. S. Jr., T. F. Yaeger, & D. Whitney (Eds.), *Appreciative inquiry: An emerging direction for organization development* (pp. 101-115). Champaign, IL: Stipes Publishing L. L. C.

Northouse, P. G. (2004). *Leadership: Theory and practice*. London: Sage.
Northouse, P. G. (2012). *Leadership: Theory and practice* (5 ed.). London: Sage.

Palmer, P. J. (1998). Leading from within In L. C. Spears (Ed.), *Insights on Leadership* (pp. 197-208). New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Partridge, H. (2018). *The power of community: How phenomenal leaders inspire their teams, wow their customers, and make bigger profits*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Popa, A. B. (2012). Learning about hardiness and servant leadership by accompanying refugees at a United Nations resettlement camp. *Journal of Leadership Studies, 6*(1), 72-78. doi:10.1002/jls.21231

Quinn, R. E. (1996). *Deep Change: Discovering the leader within*. San Francisco Jossey-Bass.
Quinn, R. E. (2004). *Building the bridge as you walk on it: A guide for leading change*. San Francisco Jossey-Bass.

Rath, T., & Conchie, B. (2008). *Strengths based leadership: Great leaders, teams, and why people follow*. New York: Gallup Press.

Reivich, K., & Shatte, A. (2002). *The resilience factor: 7 essential skills for overcoming life's inevitable obstacles*. New York: Broadway Books.

Restak, R. (2001). *Mozart's brain and the fighter pilot: Unleashing your brain's potential*. New York: Three Rivers Press.

Senge, P. M. (1990). *The fifth discipline: The art and practice of the learning organization*. New York: Currency-Doubleday.

Smith, J. L. (Winter 2002). How can we manage overload? *Future*, 10-13.

Spears, L. C. (1998). Tracing the growing impact of servant-leadership. In L. Spears (Ed.), *Insights on leadership: Service, spirit, and servant-leadership* (pp. 1-14). New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Steinhardt, M. A., Dolbier, C. L., Gottlieb, N. H., & McCallister, K. T. (2003). The relationship between hardiness, supervisor support, group cohesion, and job stress as predictors of job satisfaction. *American Journal of Health Promotion, 17*(6), 382-389.

Stieglitz, H. (1998). *Chief executives view their jobs: Today and tomorrow*. New York: Conference Board.

Stone, D. (2002. *Policy paradox: The art of political decision making* (*Revised* ed.). *New York*: *W. W. Norton and Company*.

Sturnick, J. A. (1998). *Healing Leadership*. In L. C. Spears (Ed.), *Insights on Leadership: Service, stewardship, and servant leadership* (pp. 185-193). New York: John Wiley & Sons.

Sutcliffe, K. M., & Vogus, T. J. (2003). Organizing for resilience. In K. S. Cameron, J. E. Dutton, & R. E. Quinn (Eds.), *Positive organizational scholarship: Foundations of a new discipline*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Vanscoy, K. (July 2000). The hiring crisis. *SmartBusinessMag.com*. Retrieved from SmartBusinessMag.com

Westman, M. (1990). The relationship between stress and performance: The moderating effect of hardiness. *Human Performance, 3*(3), 141-155.

Wheatley, M. J. (1999). *Leadership and the new science: Discovering order in a chaotic world* (2 ed.). San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler Publishers.

Wilde, L. L., Ebbers, L. H., Shelley, M. C., & Gmelch, W. H. (2003). Stress factors and community college deans: The stresses of their role identified. *Community College Review, 31*(3), 1-23.

Work, J. (1996). Leading a diverse workforce. In F. Hesselbein, M. Goldsmith, & R. R. Beckhard (Eds.), *The leader of the future* (pp. 71-80). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Zenger, J. H., & Folkman, J. (2002). *The Extraordinary leader: Turning good managers into great leaders*. San Francisco: McGraw Hill.

College of Business
Eastern Washington University

Journal of
International Business
Disciplines

IABD

The International Academy
of Business Disciplines

Volume 15, Number 1   May 2020

Published By:

WWW.JIBD.ORG