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**INTRODUCTION**

This paper discusses the positive leadership approach, Cameron's positive leadership model, the four positive strategies included in his model, and the leadership behaviors associated with these strategies. It then discusses the two positive practices that have been added to the model for implementation, as well as the distinction between positive strategies and positive practices discussed in this paper.

The positive leadership approach is based on a growing body of positivity research that demonstrates a strong case for integrating positive psychology (Seligman, 1999), positive organizational scholarship (POS) (Cameron, Dutton, & Quinn, 2003), and positive organizational behavior (POB) (Luthans, 2002; Luthans & Church, 2002) principles into the workplace environment. There is a growing trend toward examining how leadership behaviors affect the dynamics of the workplace and the role of leadership behaviors in promoting follower positivity, wellbeing, positive psychological capital, and performance outcomes. Additionally, research by Zbierowski & Góra, (2014), indicates that positive leadership has a significant positive effect on managerial practices, has a positive effect on both followers and leaders' outcomes, and that there are no age or work experience requirements for implementing the positive leadership approach in the workplace.

Positive leadership and authentic leadership have a common intellectual ancestor in that both emerged from research on transformational leadership. However, the concepts of POS and the work of Kim Cameron and colleagues at the University of Michigan underpin and shape positive leadership. POB is the bedrock of authentic leadership, which has been advanced primarily by Fred Luthans of the University of Nebraska.

The framework for Cameron's positive leadership model is composed of the principles and concepts that underpin theories about leaders who take an integrative approach to leveraging and affirming individual and organizational strengths by demonstrating a positive leadership orientation. "What distinguishes positive leadership from other forms of leadership is that it is elevating, exceptional, and affirmative of strengths, capabilities, and developmental potential." (Youssef-Morgan & Luthans, p.201). Positive leadership is defined as "the ways in which leaders enable positively deviant behavior, foster an affirmative organizational culture, and foster an emphasis on virtue and eudaemonism" (Cameron, 2008, p. 1). Positive deviance is an evaluative term used in positive leadership to describe outcomes that significantly exceed the norm or expected performance. Cameron (2008) proposes five positive principles for leaders aspiring to enable positive deviance in their organization, which are strikingly similar to the positive strategies in CPLM. They are as follows: enabling exceptional performance by cultivating a positive work climate, cultivating positive relationships among members, cultivating positive communication, associating work with positive meaning, and implementing these principles.

**CAMERON'S MODEL OF POSITIVE LEADERSHIP**

Cameron's positive leadership model evolved as a result of his research into high-performing organizations and validated findings from other empirical research. His model is founded on the application of principles from positive organizational scholarship (POS), positive psychology, and the literature on positive change. These principles are centered on enhancing individuals' and organizations' performance, strengths, optimism, energy, and behaviors that support positive outcomes (Cameron, 2008). His model consists of four positive strategies: fostering a positive climate, cultivating positive relationships, communicating positively, and reinforcing positive meaning. Cameron's model uses the term "positive strategies" to refer to each of the four categories of leadership behaviors that comprise the model's four positive strategies and to the types of leadership behaviors that are oriented toward the positive. He suggests several leadership behaviors that can be used to put each of the positive strategies into action, based on his own experiences and scholarship. Cameron discovered that, despite the fact that these strategies are among the most important enablers of positive deviance, leaders rarely use them. Cameron's positive leadership model (CPLM), which served as the study's foundational framework, is depicted in Figure 1 shows Cameron’s positive leadership model (CPLM).



**Figure 1. Adapted from K. S. Cameron (2008) *Positive leadership: strategies for extraordinary performance*, p. 14.**

The model's suggested positive leadership behaviors for each strategy have been empirically validated as enabling and supporting positive organizational outcomes in other studies. Fostering compassion, forgiveness, and gratitude are all examples of leadership behaviors that contribute to a positive climate. Facilitating positive energy, or creating energy networks, and reiterating strengths in the workplace all contribute to the development of positive relationships. The objective of positive communication is to obtaining favorable best- Self-reflection, particularly in relation to instances when others have observed the individual operating effectively, and the use of supportive and descriptive communication as a prerequisite and enabler of positive performance are all behaviors that contribute to the development of positive communication. Reiterating the meaning, significance, and contribution that the organization's work provides to others, as well as focusing on contribution goals rather than individual achievement goals, are all behaviors associated with fostering positive meaning. Together, these four positive strategies comprise Cameron's positive leadership model (CPLM), which leaders implement.

**Positive Organizational Practices**

Cameron (2013) introduces the concept that positive leadership practices result in positive strategies in his most recent book. Positive practices are oriented around the organization, as opposed to positive strategies, which are oriented around individual leadership behaviors. Cameron (2011) defines positive practices as "organizational-sponsored behaviors or activities." Cameron (2013, p. 151) proposes four positive practices as a means of facilitating the implementation of his model's four positive strategies. He refers to these practices as "creating positive energy networks," "positively delivering negative feedback," "establishing Everest goals," and "creating an abundance culture." His argument is that these four positive practices result in the model's four positive strategies. Two additional positive practices, the Everest goal and the Personal Management Interview program, were added to Cameron's model in this paper.

**THE FOUNDATION OF POSITIVE LEADERSHIP IN POSITIVE PSYCHOLOGY**

Positive psychology is a cornerstone of the positive leadership approach. Positive psychology emphasizes individuals' positive characteristics and what is right with them rather than what is wrong with them. Seligman and Csikszentmihalyi (2000) defined positive psychology as the study of positive subjective experiences, positive individual characteristics, and positive institutions, while advocating for a science devoted to the discovery of what makes life worthwhile. Pursuing a positive psychology focus does not imply that psychology is negative; rather, it takes a different approach to psychology by focusing on positive rather than negative phenomena, states, and interventions. Additionally, a meta-analysis of 51 positive psychology interventions aimed at cultivating positive emotions, behaviors, or cognitions involving 4,266 participants revealed that positive psychology interventions significantly improve wellbeing (Sin & Lyubomirsky, 2009).

However, one of the dangers of discussing positive psychology and positive leadership in a business setting is that they are frequently misinterpreted as "positive thinking." According to Lewis (2011, p.3), the primary distinction between positive thinking and positive psychology is that "positive psychology is subjected to the rigors of scientific experimentation and validation, implying that the phenomena discovered are reliable and repeatable." Lewis argues that positive thinking is more about anecdote and exhortation. Additionally, as Ehrenreich (2009) notes, when positive thinking is ineffective, the tendency is to take the tautological position that the proponent was not sufficiently optimistic. Positive psychology is concerned with the factors that contribute to psychological well-being, such as positive emotions, positive experiences, favorable environments, and human strengths and virtues. Additionally, there is a distinction in the literature in that positive psychology literature acknowledges the reality of negative events, emotions, and behaviors and the critical role they play in human wellbeing. Positive psychology and its theoretical underpinnings for positive leadership are distinguished from positive thinking by these dimensions.

Positive psychology has made strides in a variety of domains, including wellbeing and happiness, optimism, and hope. Seligman and Csikszentmihalyi (2000) synthesized previous research and proposed that positive subjective experiences influence the capacities for wellbeing and contentment with the past, flow and happiness in the present, and hope and optimism for the future. Additionally, they classified the domains into subjective, micro/individual, and macro/group or organizational levels of analysis. Positive subjective experiences such as wellbeing and contentment with the past, flow and happiness in the present, and hope and optimism for the future are included on the subjective level. Positive characteristics at the micro/individual level include the capacity for love, courage, aesthetic sensibility, perseverance, forgiveness, spirituality, exceptional talent, and wisdom. At the macro/group or organizational level, positive virtues and behaviors demonstrated by those in organizations encourage individuals to pursue higher levels of citizenship, responsibility, and a strong work ethic. These domains are increasingly being recognized as critical for fostering a positive approach to leadership that extends beyond the leader-follower dyad. As a result, positive psychology has begun to gain traction in fields such as psychology and organizational behavior. When applied to the concept of positive leadership, for example, positive psychology provides an understanding of the benefits of shifting the emphasis and focus from what is wrong with people and organizations to what is right, as well as strategies for accomplishing this.

**Interventions in Positive Psychology**

Meyers et al. (2013) investigated the effects of positive psychology interventions in organizational settings. They defined psychological interventions as "any deliberate activity or method aimed at cultivating positive subjective experiences with the goal of developing positive individual traits or civic virtue and positive institutions." They analyzed fifteen studies that examined the effects of such interventions in organizations. The researchers' primary finding was that positive psychological interventions in the workplace consistently improve employee well-being. According to Meyers et al. (2013), positive psychology interventions appear to be a promising tool for improving employee well-being and performance. Additionally, they proposed that such interventions had a flow-on effect of reducing stress and burnout, and to a lesser extent, depression and anxiety.

Positive psychology-based interventions are believed to be effective at increasing positive affect. Positive affect encompasses a range of valence-based emotional states and attitudes. Positive affect and positivity are used interchangeably by Fredrickson and Losada (2005) to refer to the pleasant end of a continuum. To test their hypothesis about the potential for positive psychological interventions to increase individual happiness, Seligman et al. designed a web-based study that included a placebo control exercise and five additional exercises, each with a different psychological focus on cultivating gratitude, increasing awareness of one's own strengths, and identifying character strengths. For six months, the results indicated that two of the exercises increased happiness and decreased depressive symptoms. The most effective exercises involved participants identifying and utilizing one of their top strengths in novel and different ways, as well as reflecting on and writing about three things that went well and what contributed to their success. One of the central tenets of positive leadership is to promote a strengths-based approach, express gratitude, and reinforce positive behaviors and work performance through positive recognition or noticing.

A more recent study evaluated the effectiveness of two self-administered interventions based on positive psychology aimed at increasing employee wellbeing (Kaplan, et, al. 2014). The findings of this quantitative study indicated that while the gratitude intervention increased positive affective wellbeing and self-reported gratitude, it had no effect on negative affective wellbeing or self-reported social connectedness. The study demonstrated that gratitude and social connectedness had an effect on wellbeing and established a link between these factors and a decrease in absenteeism from work due to illness. These findings add to the growing body of literature demonstrating the benefits of a positive leadership approach.

**POSITIVE ORGANIZATIONS SCHOLARSHIP (POS)**

Positive psychology is one of the underlying tenets of POS (Cameron et al., 2003), which serves as the guiding premise for the concept of positive leadership and the model used in this research. The primary objective of POS is to identify and develop positive organizational characteristics that contribute to exceptional individual and organizational performance (Cameron, et al., 2003). It is predisposed to investigating how organizations and their constituents can flourish through the development of strengths in order to achieve exceptional performance. POS was developed in response to researcher concerns that an array of organizational phenomena were being overlooked and that terms such as "flourishing" or "positive deviance" were not being used to describe outcomes; "as a result, such phenomena were neither studied nor valued" (Cameron & Spreitzer, 2012, p. 4). POS is predicated on the assumption that the "heliotropic effect exists" (Cameron, & McNaughtan, 2014. p. 457). Cameron (2008, p. xi) defines this effect as "the natural tendency of all living systems to gravitate toward that which provides life and away from that which depletes life – toward positive energy and away from negative energy."

POS has at least four connotations, all of which are associated with a positive orientation. These include adopting a positive perspective, concentrating on positively deviant performance, assuming an affirmative bias, and examining the virtuousness of the human condition at its best (Cameron, et al., 2003). Taking this approach entails viewing dynamics that are typically associated with positive attributes, such as excellence, thriving, and resilience, through a positive lens (Spreitzer, 2003). More succinctly, it is reinterpreting negative events and issues as opportunities and experiences through a different paradigmatic lens. The emphasis is frequently on "how" to see rather than "exactly what to see" (Caza & Cameron, 2009, p.100). POS serves as a unifying concept, encompassing a diverse range of theories and topics. As an umbrella concept, it draws on the full range of organizational theories in order to comprehend, explain, and predict the occurrence, causes, and consequences of positivity, and it is defined as "concerned with the study of particularly positive organizational outcomes, processes, and attributes" (Cameron et al., 2003, p. 4). It is not the nature of the phenomenon that elevates an issue to the POS domain; rather, it is the positive perspective that elevates an issue to the POS domain (Cameron & McNaughtan, 2014).

**Positive Deviance**

Positive deviance, or the ways in which organizations and their people flourish and achieve extraordinary results, is central to POS. According to Bono, Davies, and Rasch (2012), flourishing at work encompasses employee thriving (for example, vitality and learning), happiness (for example, positive moods and emotions), and engagement (e.g., job satisfaction and self-determined motivation). Positive deviance is an evaluative term that refers to behavior that should or should not occur (Clinard & Meier, 2001). Warren (2003, p. 624) defines individual deviance as "a departure from norms" that can be either constructive or destructive. To determine this, however, the deviant behavior must be compared to some standard or measure of what should or ought to be. Spreitzer and Sonenshein (2004) argue that an important criterion for positive deviance is intentions, not outcomes. They provide a definition of "intentional behaviors that significantly deviate from the norms of a referent group in honorable ways" based on a solid theoretical foundation (p. 841). They assert that, unlike Warren's definition above, their definition is applicable at both the micro/individual and macro/group or organizational levels and includes measurement criteria.

The credibility of POS, as well as the likelihood that organizations will invest in strategies that enable positive deviance, is contingent on POS's ability to demonstrate the desired effects of organizational positivity on organizational performance and improvement. Despite some reservations and debate about the terms "positive" and "positive orientation" in the literature, the terms are becoming more prevalent in academic studies. Through its emphasis on positivity and positive deviance, POS is credited with broadening rather than narrowing the scope of organizational studies (Cameron & Spreitzer, 2012). Other scholars have examined the positive orientation potential from a micro/individual and macro/group perspective.

**POSITIVE ORGANIZATION BEHAVIOR (POB)**

Additionally, positive organizational behavior (POB) is founded on positive psychology and emphasizes the importance of a positive leadership approach (Luthans, 2002). POB aspires to contribute to the enhancement of employee performance as well as the enhancement of organizational performance and competitiveness (Linley, Harrington, & Garcea, 2010). At the macro/group or organizational level, the emphasis is on follower strengths, whereas at the micro/individual level, the emphasis is on measurable positive state-like psychological capacities that are amenable to development and performance management (Luthans and Church (2002, p. 59) define POB as "the study and application of positively oriented human resource strengths and psychological capacities that can be measured, developed, and effectively managed for performance" (Luthans and Church (2002, p. 59). It places a premium on personal characteristics such as hope, optimism, resilience, and self-efficacy (Luthans, 2002). Luthan's motivation for pursuing this line of thought stemmed from his belief that the field of organizational development required a more proactive, positive approach that emphasized strengths, rather than continuing on what he saw as a downward, negative spiral of attempting to "fix what is wrong with managers and employees and focusing on weaknesses" (Luthans & Church, 2002, p. 57).

**Psychological Capital**

According to Woolley, Caza, and Levy (2011), one of the most significant contributions of POB has been the development and study of the construct of psychological capital (PsyCap). PsyCap is a term that refers to an individual's positive psychological state of development, which is determined by self-efficacy, optimism, hope, and resilience (Luthans, Avolio, Avey, & Norman, 2007). It is conceptually connected to work outcomes such as performance and behaviors and varies between individuals depending on contextual factors such as the individual's characteristics or work with an inspirational leader (Luthans, Avolio, et al., 2007). More recently, Youssef and Luthans (2010) proposed that an individual's PsyCap is determined by the combination of capacities. Additionally, they argue that this is a more reliable predictor of workplace performance, satisfaction, and absenteeism than the individual component capacities. Recent empirical research by Luthans, Youssef, Sweetman, and Harms (2013) extended PsyCap into the wellbeing domain; a recent study of a cross section of 523 employees examined the relationship PsyCap domains of employee attitude, behavior, and performance and discovered a link between relationship PsyCap and health PsyCap. According to the researchers, this combination aided in job and life satisfaction, as well as overall well-being. For leaders, these findings have implications for overcoming the obstacles associated with influencing positivity, as well as for comprehending and developing workplace wellbeing and performance.

Self-efficacy or confidence is a recurring theme in relation to the positive approach. Bandura (2000) contended that the more confident an individual is, the more likely they are to embrace a new challenge, desire to perform well in the task, and devote additional effort and motivation to completing the task successfully. Additionally, when confronted with obstacles or initial failure, the individual will demonstrate increased persistence in order to complete the task successfully. These capacities are very similar to those suggested by Luthans (2002) as necessary for a highly confident leader or employee to achieve effectiveness and high performance in the workplace. Stajkovic and Luthans (1998) found a stronger relationship between self-efficacy and work-related performance than other popular organizational behavior domains in a meta-analysis of 114 studies. According to Luthans and Church (2002), the true value of a POB approach is in its application to the development and performance improvement of both leaders and employees. Luthans (2002) argues that it is the development and performance orientation that distinguishes POB from the broader positive psychology movement.

**POSITIVE LEADERSHIP**

POS and POB have aided in the evolution toward a more holistic view of leadership. Cameron (2008, p. 1) defines positive leadership as "the ways in which leaders enable positively deviant behavior, foster an affirmative orientation in organizations, and foster an emphasis on virtue and eudaemonism." Positive leadership, he argues, does not imply that "leaders should simply smile and everything will be fine" (p. 104). Rather than that, "positive leadership implies even higher performance standards, more rigorous expectations, and achievement that far exceeds customary or average execution" (p. 104). Individuals advance to leadership roles in organizations via a variety of paths and collectively bring a range of life, work, and emotional experiences. Avolio, Griffith, Wernsing, and Walumbwa (2010) concluded in their summary of a comprehensive meta-analysis of existing research on leadership that people develop into leadership roles as a result of approximately two-thirds life experience and one-third heritability. They argue that this demonstrates the importance of life experiences over innate abilities. Additionally, Zbierowski & Góra (2014) discovered that age and prior work experience have no negative effect on one's ability to adopt a positive leadership orientation. This may also imply that the capacity to learn and adopt a positive leadership approach is more dependent on mindset than on skill set, which may influence leaders' life experiences.

Others have developed their own definitions of positive leadership and evaluated them in the context of a variety of relationships and employee affect. Kelloway et al. (2013) defined positive leadership as "leadership behaviors that result in followers experiencing positive emotions" and positive leadership behaviors as "those behaviors that leaders enact that result in followers experiencing more positive emotions" (2013, p. 108). Kelloway et al. (2013) conducted two related studies based on these definitions and published them in the same academic article. In the first study, 1,600 employees at a long-term nursing care facility in eastern Canada responded to a questionnaire containing five items assessing positive leadership. Participants were asked to reflect on their previous four months of work and indicate how frequently their leader thanked them, complimented them, praised their job performance, cheered them up, went above and beyond to assist them, and complimented them. Each item was scored on a five-point scale, with higher scores indicating greater behavior frequency. The findings indicated that positive leadership behaviors, as measured by their newly developed measures, are empirically distinct from transformational leadership behaviors and contributed to the prediction of context-specific and context-free wellbeing in addition to the prediction attributed to transformational leadership.

Kelloway et al. (2013) sought to extend the findings of the first study by examining positive leadership behaviors in a short-term study involving a sample of 26 full-time employees from a Canadian coffee retail organization. Participants kept a confidential daily diary for three weeks. Participants completed a survey six times during the same period, using a previously developed five-item positive leadership survey with a four-point Likert-type response scale. According to the findings, Kelloway et al. (2013) concluded that teaching leaders to engage in positive interactions with their followers has a significant positive effect on followers. Both studies contributed to the development of a link between positive emotions and positive leadership behaviors. However, the quantitative nature of the studies and the fact that they used followers rather than leaders as data sources do not close the knowledge gap regarding the leader's experience with positive leadership implementation. While survey responses were based on participant recall of past events and emotions, both studies found that employees noticed and valued positive leadership behaviors.

There is growing recognition that one of the most critical and influential relationships in the workplace is that between an employee and his or her immediate supervisor (Lazear, Shaw, & Stanton, 2012). Leaders are accountable for the workplace's productivity and achievement of objectives. Lazear et al. (2012) examined the effects of leaders' behaviors on the productivity of their direct report employees from June 2006 to May 2010. They used daily productivity transaction records covering 23,878 individual employees and 1,940 direct leaders from a United States customer service-based organization in the technology sector. They discovered that leaders are critical, and while their productivity varies, a leader's marginal product is roughly double that of a typical employee. High-quality leaders are defined as those who approach teaching, motivating, and communicating with their employees with a positive attitude. They have a greater beneficial effect on high-performing employees than on low-performing employees. Additionally, Lazear et al. discovered that, from an employee's perspective, "the relationship with one's boss is likely to be as, if not more, important than any other worker's relationship" (2012, p.3). The findings that replacing a leader who is in the lower 10% of leader quality with one who is in the upper 10% of leader quality can increase a team's total productivity output by about the same amount as adding another employee to a nine-person team are particularly interesting for the positive leadership approach. These findings reaffirm the importance of the employee-leader relationship in the workplace, as well as the significance, impact, and potential of positive leadership behaviors.

**POSITIOVE STRATEGIES**

Cameron proposes four interrelated and mutually reinforcing strategies for bringing his positive leadership model to life: fostering a positive climate, developing positive relationships, engaging in positive communication, and reinforcing positive meaning (Cameron, 2008). He notes that while this list is not exhaustive or exhaustive, observation and empirical evidence indicate that these strategies are among the most important enablers of positively deviant performance. While Cameron emphasizes the strategies' interconnected and mutually reinforcing nature, he proposes that when implementing positive strategies, they should be tailored to the unique circumstances in which leaders lead (Cameron, 2008, 2012). His suggestion is that individuals identify two or three high-priority behaviors that could have a significant impact on their area of responsibility's positive leadership effectiveness.

**Positive Climate**

Cameron's first of four CPLM strategies is to foster a positive climate. This strategy focuses on leader activities that foster workplace compassion, forgiveness, and gratitude. The term "positive climate" refers to the predominance of positive emotions over negative emotions in a work environment (Smidts, Pruyin, & Van Riel, 2001). The organizational climate is conceptualized as a reflection of employees' perceptions of their work environment and encompasses all visible aspects of a workplace, including working conditions, supervisory style, and interpersonal relationships (Momeni, 2009). Considerable research indicates a strong correlation between a positive workplace climate and positive performance, as well as with leaders' and organizations' demonstrations of compassion, forgiveness, and gratitude.

Casey (2011) examined this premise in a military setting, within the context of a personnel resiliency and effectiveness program. The findings indicated a correlation between a positive climate and performance. Additionally, they demonstrated that there were compounding effects that extended to the larger military unit. Cameron et al. (2004) discovered that organizations that prioritized compassion, forgiveness, and gratitude outperformed other organizations on a variety of critical operational indicators. Cameron (2003) discovered statistically significant associations between organizational virtue and objectively measured profitability in a sample of recently downsized organizations across 16 industry sectors.

Increased communication, shared decision-making, and establishing a shared vision strengthened job satisfaction and organizational commitment, according to a study that examined an eight-year journey to change and improve the culture and climate of a nursing school (Springer, Clark, Strohfus, & Belcheir, 2012). Johnsrud and Rosser (2002) discovered that employees' perceptions of the quality of their work environment had a significant effect on job satisfaction and performance in an educational setting. Additionally, research indicates that climate is subject to rapid change as a result of dynamic events, crises, and the nature of workplace and organizational decisions (Springer et al., 2012).

Accepting workplace climate as a critical enabler of performance, as Cooke and Meyer (2007) do, the fundamental strategic objective becomes creating the types of workplace experiences and conditions that will elicit the desired responses from employees. Cameron (2008) argued in support of this view, arguing that leadership strategies play a significant role in determining whether a climate is positive or negative. He argued that strategies that contribute to a positive climate include modeling and encouraging acts of compassion, promoting collective forgiveness, upholding standards, providing support, and encouraging expressions of gratitude. These concepts are components of his positive leadership model and the associated leadership behaviors.

***Leadership Influence***

Hannah, Woolfolk, and Lord (2009) posited that if a leader establishes a frame of mind that reinforces positive norms, they can influence their followers' self-constructs, and through modeling, similar positive attributes are developed in and transferrable to followers. The more positive self-aspects a leader holds and manifests through positive leadership behaviors, the more positive reinforcement they will receive from their followers, creating a virtuous cycle of leadership development. As a result, a strengths-based culture is reinforced and the organizational climate is influenced.

These assertions are borne out by additional research indicating that leaders can influence followers' self-strategies through behavior modeling (Gardner & Avolio, 1998; Lord & Brown, 2004). Enabling positive emotions fosters a positive climate, which generates more positive emotions and promotes upward spirals of improved performance (Cameron, 2012; Fredrickson, 2003). These emotions are contagious and can be transmitted from leaders to followers via an emotional contagion effect. Emotional contagion is a term that refers to a family of phenomena that describes the interpersonal influence of emotions (Elfenbein, 2007) and the manner in which an individual or group influences the emotions and attitudes of another individual or group, either unintentionally or explicitly (Barsade, 2002). In other words, if the leader exhibits positive or negative behaviors or emotions, these can be transmitted to followers.

***Positive Emotions***

Significant research indicates that positive emotions, opportunities, and relationships all contribute to the development and maintenance of a positive climate in the workplace, and that a positive climate is strongly associated with positive performance. Performance is influenced by a variety of factors. Judge, Thoresen, Bono, and Patton (2001) discovered a significant correlation between positive emotions, job satisfaction, and productivity in a meta-analytic study. Bono and Ilies (2006) discovered that when leaders express positive emotions, it increases employees' perceptions of the leader's effectiveness and increases their desire to work for them. Bagozzi (2003), Fredrickson and Losada (2005), and others have demonstrated through their research that conditions that enable and foster positive emotions result in positive optimization of individual and organizational conditions. Positive emotions-inducing behaviors such as modeling and encouraging acts of positive noticing and responding, demonstrating forgiveness for mistakes, and giving and encouraging expressions of gratitude are all likely to contribute to fostering a positive climate (Cameron, 2008). Additionally, it has been demonstrated that leaders who reinforce these behaviors are more effective at achieving bottom-line results than typical leaders (Cameron, 2003).

According to the literature reviewed above, a leader's approach has a direct effect on workplace climate. Additionally, there is mounting evidence indicating a strong correlation between leadership behaviors, leader-follower relationships, the work environment, and employee health (Kelloway & Barling, 2010). The leadership style is undoubtedly a significant factor in defining the strength, direction, and development of a workplace climate. Numerous studies have established a link between leadership quality and both positive and negative outcomes, including workplace stress, injuries, and employee health (Arnold et al., 2007).

***Compassion and Well-Being***

A positive work environment and employee well-being are never more critical than in the aftermath of traumatic events. Whether occurring internally or externally to the workplace, whether triggered by human or natural action, disaster and trauma can strike at any time. Dutton et al. (2002) discovered that empathy was insufficient in such circumstances, did not elicit a broader response, and thus had a limited capacity for organizational healing. However, organizational compassion capacity did have an effect on how quickly and effectively people recovered from disaster events. Their research established four dimensions of organizational compassion: scope, scale, speed, and specialization. The first three pertain to the organization's overall response, while the fourth pertains to the extent to which the organization responds to the specific needs of an individual or group within the organization, such as how an organization responds to parents who must adjust work hours to care for children when schools are closed due to a disaster.

Another subsequent study discovered similar findings regarding critical leadership behaviors during times of trauma. These behaviors included actively observing what employees were doing, providing positive reinforcement and support, and encouraging sharing, where appropriate, through forums for the safe expression of individual or collective emotions (Kanov, Maitlis, Worline, Dutton, Frost, & Lilius, 2004). Facilitating compassion in the workplace is not frequently associated with the concept of leadership in its broadest sense. Nonetheless, a number of leadership behaviors have the potential to contribute to the creation of a positive work environment in the midst of trauma's chaos. These leadership behaviors include leaders being present in the workplace, establishing a context for meaning and action, and fostering an environment in which employees can express their feelings in order to make sense of their situation and develop strategies for coping and resolving the trauma.

Numerous empirical studies have established that demonstrating compassion, forgiveness, and gratitude fosters a positive work environment, which in turn influences higher workplace performance. Positive leadership behaviors have been identified as a significant predictor of organizational climate in these circumstances (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). These studies underscore the critical nature of positive leadership behaviors that contribute to a positive climate. The philosophy that underpins positive leadership has the potential to influence and strengthen a work environment's climate. The underlying principles of positive leadership are also capable of this. The literature indicates that positive leadership does foster a positive climate at any time, but particularly during times of trauma.

Consistent with the aforementioned studies were the findings of a New Zealand study conducted in the aftermath of the catastrophic Christchurch/Canterbury 2010-2011 earthquakes. Nilakant, Walker, and Rochford (2013) conducted an investigation into how employees think and feel following a disaster. They used an inductive qualitative design with 47 respondents from four Christchurch organizations, conducting semi-structured interviews. The findings indicated that a number of factors contribute to effective immediate and post-disaster workplace management. The most pertinent finding is the importance of organizational response and the critical role of supervisors' leadership behaviors, particularly their ability to respond to practical and emotional workplace needs. These factors were critical in shaping employees' post-disaster perceptions of their leaders and the organization's response to employee care in the post-disaster environment.

According to the literature, how an organization responds to, or does not respond to, an employee's plight has an effect on both employee and organizational performance in such circumstances. Sanchez, Korbin, and Viscarra (1995) found partial support for their prediction that relief services provided to employees following a natural disaster would reduce employee stress levels. They argue that assisting employees in reestablishing normalcy is not only a good citizenship gesture, but also a practical intervention that enables organizations to continue operating in such circumstances. Contrary to expectations, they discovered that forms of support other than meeting employees' basic needs had little effect on employee stress over a 90-day period following the disaster.

**Positive Relationships**

Cameron's second positive strategy is to cultivate positive relationships. This is a critical aspect of establishing and maintaining a favorable climate. Fostering positive relationships places an emphasis on the facilitation and modeling of positive energy by leaders, as well as on the promotion of high-quality relationships in the workplace. According to Roberts (2007), a positive relationship is "one in which a genuine sense of relatedness and mutuality exists" (p. 31). Dutton and Ragins (2007, p. 5) offer a more esoteric definition of positive relationships, describing them as "a generative source of enrichment, vitality, and learning." According to researchers, a strong partnership approach is required to maximize the value of leaders and followers in the workplace (Uhl-Bien, Maslyn, & Ospina, 2012).

Positive leadership does not require viewing leadership as a relationship. As with any type of relationship, the implication is that both parties contribute to the nature of the relationship and its subsequent outcomes in some way. Cameron's (2008) approach to positive leadership is founded on the principle of facilitating the best of the human condition. This approach bolsters the argument that effective leadership is not a "one-way street" (Northhouse, 2004, p. 113).

***Relationships Quality***

The "high quality connections" are a particular type of positive relationship associated with positive leadership (Dutton & Heaphy, 2003, p. 264). Short-term, dyadic, positive interactions at work constitute high-quality connections. According to Dutton and Heaphy, these connections are perceived as positive, life-enhancing, life-giving interactions that are "felt" and "sensed" (p. 265), foster trust and respect, and have a greater emotional carrying capacity. In other words, such connections can handle a greater range of emotions much more effectively than low-quality connections, which tend to have a depleting or even degrading toxic effect (Frost, 2003) and the potential to cause damage (Dutton & Heaphy, 2003). Another term for these connections is "high-quality exchange relationships," in which followers receive significant attention and high-quality assignments in exchange for their productivity (Graen & Uhi-Bien, 1995, p. 227). In contrast to the theory of high-quality connections, however, high-quality exchange relationships lack the critical positivity orientation that underpins high-quality connections. The critical positivity focus serves as the bedrock philosophy for both high-quality connections and positive leadership.

According to Dutton (2009), promoting high-quality connections results in high-quality interpersonal relationships at work, which are beneficial for both individuals and organizations. Additionally, these studies discovered that high-quality connections improve communication, collaboration, motivation, and learning behaviors. Additionally, a number of studies have demonstrated that positive relationships promote healthier teamwork and can have an effect on workplace processes such as error identification and correction (Weick & Roberts, 1993), willingness to cooperate and work collaboratively (Gittell, 2003), and increased levels of commitment to an organization (Gittell, 2003). (Shahid & Azhar, 2013). There is empirical evidence that such relationships foster a greater degree of resiliency in individuals and groups, enhancing their capacity to cope with and recover from difficult experiences. Additionally, strengthened relationships help build social capital and form reserves that help organizations function more effectively (Gittell, et al., 2006). Positive strategies and practices have the potential to foster positive relationships and a positive work environment. This improves the ability of the organization and group to absorb trauma and recover from adversity, as well as to avoid deteriorating performance (Cameron, et al., 2011).

While high-quality connections are subjective, research indicates that when they occur, a person is likely to feel vital and alive. The altered brain patterns detected during positive interactions between two people provide evidence for this claim (Lewis, 2011; Lewis, Amini, & Lannan, 2000). Several additional studies found positive correlations between positive relationships, emotional well-being, and physical well-being, as well as between these factors and positive social relationships in the workplace. Heaphy and Dutton (2008) discovered that positive social relationships have a beneficial effect on the heart, hormone, and immune systems, enhancing both wellbeing and the nature of relationships. An earlier study of these factors found that positive workplace interactions between supervisors and coworkers had a direct effect on lowering both heart and blood pressure rates (Karlin, Brondolo, & Schwartz, 2003). Such studies and their findings contribute to the growing recognition of the critical role of positive workplace relationships in achieving both intrinsic and extrinsic goals for individuals and organizations, particularly during stressful times and in the aftermath of stressful events.

Additionally, emerging evidence from the field of neuroscience indicates that positive relationships promote beneficial psychological and physiological effects, which in turn affect performance and outcomes. Other studies have examined additional facets of positive relationships and the possible explanations for why positive relationships are likely to have beneficial effects on individuals and relationships in general. What has been discovered is that devoting time and support to a relationship has a beneficial effect on both the relationship and the giver (Brown & Brown, 2006; Brown, Nesse, Vinokur, & Smith, 2003; Grant, Dutton & Russo, 2008).

Avey, Avolio, and Luthans (2011) examined the effect of leader positivity on follower positivity and performance in a field experiment using quantitative analysis with a sample of 106 engineers. The findings indicated a positive relationship between leaders' optimism and the optimism and performance of followers. Along with providing empirical support for the beneficial effects of leaders' positivity on the positivity and performance of followers, they discovered that leader positivity can be transferred to followers via electronic means, such as email communication. This adds to the thinking and literature on positive leadership behaviors discussed in Section 3.7.1.1 by indicating that the contagion effect of positive leadership behaviors can be transmitted through written communication as well as verbal and physical interactions.

***Positive Energy***

Cameron's positive leadership model proposes a strategy for fostering positive relationships that involves leaders modeling and facilitating positive energy in the workplace. Cameron (2008) and Dutton and Ragins (2007) argued that one of the most significant outcomes of research on positively deviant performance has been work on understanding positive energy networks (Baker, Cross, & Wooten, 2003; Cross, Baker, & Parker, 2003; Cross, Ehrilich, Dawson, & Helferich, 2008). Cross et al. (2003) assessed energy within seven large groups in three organizations to better understand how energy is generated in day-to-day interactions with others. Numerous their findings are particularly pertinent to positive relationships, to the positive leadership approach in general, and to the implementation of CPLM in particular. They found that interactions with others whom individuals considered to be credible were energizing, as were interactions that created compelling visions, and interactions where individuals could meaningfully contribute.

A 2012 global workforce study of 32,000 full-time employees across a variety of industries and countries identified two critical areas on which organizations must focus to achieve high performance. The first focuses on effectively enabling employees through internal support, resources, and tools, while the second focuses on creating an energizing work environment. Additionally, they discovered that while many organizations are pursuing a variety of initiatives and wellness initiatives, there is an obvious need to "embrace the concept of workplace energy on a much broader scale" (Towers Watson, 2012, p. 4).

According to a quantitative study in which employees rated their own emotional responses to leader interactions, followers exposed to an energizing leader were significantly more likely to have higher personal wellbeing, job satisfaction, engagement, and performance. Additionally, positive spillover effects were observed for family well-being, workplace cohesion, learning, creativity, and workplace performance (Owens, Baker, & Cameron, 2013, cited in Cameron, 2014). Owens, Baker, McDaniel Sumpter, and Cameron (2015) examined the role of energy in relational interactions in organizations, drawing on four recent studies. Their research established that the energy generated by such interactions, particularly those between leaders and followers, is associated with improvements in follower job engagement and performance. Furthermore, they contend that their findings expand the role of leaders to include that of being a “energy broker” (p. 11) in the workplace. Such findings significantly support and endorse the need for research to find ways in which leaders can implement positive leadership strategies in the workplace.

The concept of "energizers and de-energizers" is inextricably linked to developing positive relationships and positive energy in the workplace (Cross, et al., 2003, p. 51). The term "energizers" refers to individuals who create opportunities for others to participate in conversations and contribute positively in ways that make them feel heard and valued. The other term, "de-energizers," refers to individuals who, by contrast, do not create these opportunities and, through primarily negative behaviors, tend to deplete the strength and energy of those with whom they interact. Additionally, Cross et al. discovered that high performing organizations have three times the number of energizers as average performing organizations. Recently, Gerbasi, Porath, Parker, Spreitzer, and Cross (2015) discovered an association between de-energizing relationships and decreased performance. Additionally, they concluded that de-energizing relationships should not be overlooked because they have a negative effect on an individual's performance and that such behaviors can change when positively addressed. Cross et al. (2003), like Cameron, propose that people can learn to be energizers (2008, 2013). They all contend that it is not an inherent attribute and individuals who exude positive energy positively affect the workplace. Furthermore, individuals who energies others are better performers, and when there is choice those perceived as energizers, in the workplace will be sought by others regardless of whether the de-energizers are the ones with the necessary knowledge and expertise that is being sought (Baker, et al., 2003). (Baker, et al., 2003).

Despite valuable research on energy networks, until recently, leaders had little practical guidance for identifying and working with energizers and de-energizers in the workplace. Cameron (2013) addressed this in his most recent positive leadership publication by outlining a number of the developable characteristics that differentiate energizers from de-energizers. Additionally, he suggested activities that would promote positive energy in the workplace. This helps bridge the divide between academic theorizing about positive leadership and the need for practical guidance for leaders wishing to put the theories into practice.

**Positive Communication**

Positive relationships are composed of a variety of components, the majority of which are created and enhanced through communication, particularly positive communication. Positive communication is the third of Cameron’s positive strategies, and it underpins the strategies of fostering positive climate and developing positive relationships. Communication was considered a critical component of enabling and maintaining positive climate in the environment within which this study was undertaken, as it would in any internal and external environment affected by natural disaster events. Furthermore, “leadership and communication are inextricably intertwined” (Van Wart, 2013, p. 554). (Van Wart, 2013, p. 554). Cameron (2012) argued that positive communication is a critical enabler of positive leadership and that positive communication occurs when affirmative and supportive language takes the place of critical and negative language in organizations.

***Emotions, Communication, and Performance***

Increasing the ratio of positive to negative communication and utilizing descriptive, supportive communication are critical components of Cameron's model's positive communication strategy. Numerous research studies have established that high-performing teams exhibit a high ratio of positive to negative communication. Fredrickson (2013) revised her thinking on positivity ratios and concluded that the mathematical claim that the positivity ratio has a critical tipping point is unfounded. While she expressed reservations about Losada's (1999) mathematical modeling, she noted that substantial evidence continues to support the conclusion that higher positive ratios are predictive of flourishing mental health and other beneficial outcomes.

Regardless of the latest research on positivity ratios, the underlying message for leaders remains the same: be mindful of the negative to positive ratio in interactions and communication. Losada and Heaphy conducted a 2004 study in which they observed 60 senior management teams during business meetings, focusing on the ratio of positive to negative comments and the ratio of questions to advocacy and comments. They classified the teams into three performance levels based on profitability, 360-degree feedback results, and customer satisfaction ratings. They discovered that the most profitable, productive, and effective teams had a 5:1 ratio of positive to negative statements during work interactions, whereas the lowest performing teams had a 1:3 ratio of positive to negative statements. Gottman (1994) discovered that the same 5:1 ratio of positives to negatives was also a predictor of the sustainability and quality of marital relationships in his predictive studies of successful marriages and divorces. Clearly, the prevalence of positive comments contributes significantly to the establishment and maintenance of positive communication, positive relationships, and a positive work environment.

Emotions and performance have been linked empirically. Fredrickson and Losada (2005) discovered that individuals who experience a positive-to-negative emotion ratio of at least 3:1 tend to thrive in terms of mental health and individual performance. Additionally, their research established a 13:1 upper limit for the positive to negative ratio. They proposed that when work groups exceed the 13:1 ratio, things are likely to deteriorate and positive reinforcement becomes ineffective due to its diminishing effectiveness with repeated use. Regardless of the accuracy issue with the modeling element (Brown, Sokal, & Friedman, 2013) and the paper's and model-based predictions' withdrawal, the remaining elements of the study remain valid (Fredrickson, 2013). The critical underlying message for leaders who practice positive leadership is to maintain a positive balance in their workplace interactions and communications.

Two studies (Dutton, 2003; Quinn & Dutton, 2005) demonstrate that a positive work environment and supportive communication are necessary conditions for and enablers of positive organizational performance. Cameron (2008, 2012) argued that leaders' communication styles are a significant factor in the emergence of positive organizational performance, which results in positively deviant performance. His argument is that it is critical to communicate both positive and negative messages in supportive, growth-promoting ways. He argues that leaders can also enable positive deviance through the use of supportive communication, specifically how they deliver negative or corrective messages when necessary.

**Supportive Communication**

The theory of supportive, and particularly descriptive, communication evolved from the work of Jack Gibb (1961), who was one of the first scholars to attempt to describe and define communication behaviors aimed at reducing defensiveness in interpersonal interactions. He argued that one way to understand communication is to view it through the lens of a social process rather than a language process. Additionally, fundamental changes in the communication climate require fundamental shifts in interpersonal relationships. Gibb (1961) based his findings on an eight-year investigation of the arousal and maintenance of defensive behavior in small task-oriented groups within the American naval services. He developed a measurement instrument and defined defensive behavior as "the behavior that occurs when an individual perceives or anticipates danger in a group" (p. 141). Despite criticism of Gibb's original instrument's underlying dimensionality (Costigan & Schmeidler, 1984), it was later refined and used as a conceptual lens in other studies. Statistical analysis revealed significant predictive relationships between positive spontaneous and empathic behaviors and perceptions of supervisor effectiveness, relational satisfaction, and job satisfaction in one study (Czech & Forward, 2013). According to a previous study, "the concept of supportive and defensive communication is a strong and useful one" (Forward, Czech, & Lee, 2011, p.12).

Another study determined that supportive communication is a necessary component of interpersonal effectiveness and identified supportive communication components as being nonjudgmental, empathic, and accepting, as well as refraining from making assumptions about the other person's motivations (Myers & Rocca, 2001). The concept of supportive and descriptive communication is incorporated into Cameron's model as a component of the positive communication strategy. One of the most important is the use of descriptive rather than evaluative statements and using descriptive communication, which he explains as having three steps of providing an objective description: identifying factual, validated elements of what has occurred, delivering these with empathy, and delivering these with a focus on the issue, not the person (Cameron, 2008, 2012, 2013). (Cameron, 2008, 2012, 2013). In essence, applying positive communication to situations of tension and disagreement can build positive climate and positive relationships. Additionally, the concept serves as a practical tool to assist leaders in implementing positive leadership practices.

Positive communication's practical importance is evident throughout the reviewed literature. Positive communication, in essence, must be a circular, interactive process, not a one-way, linear activity. The literature reviewed consistently emphasizes the critical importance of positive communication and leadership behaviors in fostering a positive workplace climate and encouraging positive relationships. Positive communication is critical to the successful implementation of Cameron's (2008) positive leadership model. The positive communication strategy is founded on increasing the positivity ratio in interactions and on the use of supportive and descriptive communication.

**Positive Meaning**

The fourth strategy in the positive leadership model is creating and fostering positive meaning. This strategy is focused on instilling and fostering a sense of purpose and meaning in employees' work. Meaning and significance in the workplace are achieved when "the work and/or its context are perceived to be, at the very least, purposeful and significant" by its practitioners (Pratt & Ashforth, 2003, p. 311). Pratt and Ashforth (2003) suggested that positive meaning is predicated on the premise that it benefits the individual in some way and that fostering meaningfulness at work may actually require two distinct sets of practices. They are those that seek to alter the nature of the relationships between the organization's members and those that seek to advance the organization's goals, values, and beliefs. They suggested that implementing both practices concurrently helps foster workplace meaning. They did note, however, that creating meaning at work is not the only way to improve performance. They emphasized the importance of process integrity and cautioned against manipulation, stating that it is likely to result in disillusionment, alienation, and turnover where it occurs. Wrzesniewski, McCauley, Rozin, and Schwartz (1997) examined 196 participants representing a range of occupations. According to their findings, individuals typically associate their work with one of three types of meaning: job, career, or calling. They contended that the distinctions are not necessarily occupation-specific and that within occupations, it is conceivably possible for different individuals involved in the same type of work to assign all three meanings to the same type of work. They further contended that those with a calling orientation have a stronger and more rewarding relationship with their work as well as more enjoyment and satisfaction from that work. Hall and Chandler (2005) defined a sense of calling in one’s work as “a sense of purpose, that this is the work that one was meant to do” (p. 154). (p. 154).

Additionally, Wrzesniewski et al. (1997) discovered that individuals with a calling orientation actively seek work that satisfies their individual need for meaning. The more an individual views their work as a calling and believes their work is good and right, the more meaningful the sense will be (Grant, 2008). Additionally, it has been discovered that meaning at work is associated with a number of positive factors, including high levels of job satisfaction, lower rates of work-related alcoholism, lower rates of work/life conflict, higher levels of intrinsic motivation, and greater certainty and self-efficacy regarding career decisions (Steger & Dik, 2010; Judge, et al., 2001; Wrzesniewski, 2003). Additionally, Cameron and Lavine (2006) assert that a sense of calling or a proclivity for internalization is strongly associated with positively deviant performance.

The importance of work orientation, workplace relationships, and finding meaning in one's work may never be more apparent than in disaster situations. These factors become even more critical when an organization and its employees play a critical role in both the immediate disaster response and the post-event management of a disaster. One would intuitively expect to find a sizable number of employees with a strong orientation toward assigning a calling meaning to the type of work they perform and an organization with a strong emphasis on the importance of the employees and the organization's work in such organizations. However, a Canadian study (Wilson, 2009) emphasized the subjective, individual, and nebulous nature of the concept of meaning and the critical nature of workplace positive meaning. With staff from a provincial Crown corporation and a provincial statutory agency in British Columbia, the study examined five hypothetical disaster scenarios. Both organizations examined in the study were the sole providers and first responders of critical core services necessary for the recovery and restoration of essential services in British Columbia. The researcher presented each of the 218 employees with five different disaster scenarios and assessed their willingness and ability to report to work in the event of a disaster. In the earthquake scenario, self-reported likelihood of returning to work was 24%, with 14% unsure, and a sizable 62 percent very unlikely or unlikely to return to work following such an event.

Other researchers have discovered that a sense of purpose in one's work is associated with positive outcomes and exceptional individual and organizational performance (Cameron, 2007; Cameron & Lavine, 2006; Grant, 2007, 2008). Positive leaders effectively foster a sense of meaning by emphasizing the positive benefits of their work and by prioritizing contribution goals over achievement goals (Cameron, 2008, 2007).

**CONCLUSION**

This literature review indicates a growing research agenda related to the positive leadership approach and to the continued expansion and refinement of the foundational theories that underpin the principles of positive leadership. There was strong support for incorporating POS and positive psychology principles into the workplace environment, as well as for each of Cameron's four positive leadership strategies. There is an increasing interest in examining how leadership behaviors affect workplace dynamics and the impact of leadership behaviors on follower positivity, wellbeing, and performance outcomes.

According to research, positive leadership has a significant positive effect on managerial practices and is not dependent on age or work experience. Additionally, positive leadership has an effect on both followers and leaders. Leaders achieve higher levels of wellbeing, happiness, and life satisfaction than followers (Zbierowski & Góra, 2014).

The positive leadership approach, and more specifically the four positive strategies proposed by Cameron in his model, indicated that leadership behaviors that foster a positive climate, develop positive relationships, engage in positive communication, and reinforce positive meaning in the workplace have the potential to improve leader, follower, and workplace outcomes. The literature review revealed that each of the four strategies in Cameron's model has the potential to have a positive effect on workplace outcomes in situations of trauma and natural disaster, both individually and in combination. Positive interventions and positive leadership behaviors are increasingly being linked in empirical research. For example, Cameron et al. (2011) discovered that over time, improvements in positive practices are likely to result in improvements in certain organizational effectiveness indicators. Additionally, research indicates that positive practices have the potential to protect organizations and their constituents from the negative effects of trauma or distress.
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