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The Reflective Path to Leadership

LEADERSHIP

The topic of leadership has been a well-studied one and dates all the way back to the nineteenth century, when the Great Man Theory was first introduced and propagated by Thomas Carlyle (1840). Despite the vastness of literature available on the leadership topic, this literature review is concerned with the antecedents, correlates, and measurement of leadership. The term leadership can be defined as the process of convincing other individuals to put aside their personal motivations to reach a shared goal that is advantageous for the group (Hogan, Curphy, & Hogan, 1994). Leadership has been conceptualized in two primary ways: leadership emergence and leadership effectiveness (Lord, De Vader, & Alliger, 1986). Although both conceptualizations of leadership involve the perceptions of others, leadership emergence represents the descriptive perceptions of an outstanding individual in a team setting while leadership effectiveness refers to the normative perceptions of agreement with an individual’s leadership performance (Kaiser, Hogan, & Craig, 2008). In fact, a study conducted by Foti and Hauenstein (2007) has even demonstrated that leadership emergence and leadership effectiveness are correlated with different variables. Their study found that leadership emergence is best predicted by cognitive ability, while leadership effectiveness (operationalized as promotions) is best predicted by personality (Foti & Hauenstein, 2007). Unfortunately, the lack of clarity in distinguishing between the two conceptualizations of leadership has led to an overgeneralization and application of study findings concerning the relationship between personality and leadership emergence to leadership effectiveness (for example, the misinterpretation of reviews carried out by Mann (1959) and Stogdill (1948) (Lord, De Vader, & Alliger, 1986).

Leadership Emergence

Emergent leaders can be referred to as team members who exercise considerable influence over other members even when holding no formal leadership positions (Schneider & Goktepe, 1983) and as alluded to in the above section, leadership emergence represents the descriptive perceptions of an outstanding individual in a team setting (Kaiser, Hogan, & Craig, 2008).

According to emergent leadership theory, individuals arise as leaders from a team through competition and elimination. Team members seen as rigid and unacquainted are usually excluded from the leader selection process and the remaining members are evaluated by the group through the process of competition. One by one the competitors get eliminated, until a final leader who meets the team’s requirements emerges (Johnson & Bechler, 1998). This theory also posits that there are particular behaviours and traits that more often characterize individuals who get eliminated, and a separate pattern of behaviours and skills that reliably ends up in leadership selection (Foti, Fraser, & Lord, 1982).

The perceptions that constitute leadership emergence need to be considered as they make up a significant part of many organizations’ social fabric. Being seen
as a leader bestows an individual with greater power in management (Foti, Fraser, & Lord, 1982) and such leadership perceptions can also encourage followers’ commitment to a group (Pfeffer, 1981).

In general, research on leadership emergence investigates the different variables related to an individual being seen as a leader when there is not much information on this individual’s leadership performance (Hogan, Curphy, & Hogan, 1994). One technique commonly used to examine leadership emergence is the leaderless group discussion (LGD). This method often involves bringing together a group of persons to solve a problem or engage in an informal conversation without assigning a team leader, thus inevitably allowing chance for any member to assume a leadership role. Outside of research purposes, LGD has also been used in assessment centres for the selection of leaders (Ensari, Riggio, Christian, & Carlslaw, 2011). The technique’s reliability has been validated in a study that produced a correlation of $r = .41$ between LGD ratings and supervisor ratings of leadership potential two years later (Riggio, Mayes, & Schleicher, 2003), implying that LGD can serve as an indicator of future leadership emergence.

Apart from observing leadership emergence through leaderless group discussions (LGD), leadership emergence can also be measured using scales that concentrate on describing an individual’s impact and dominance in a team setting (Lanaj & Hollenbeck, 2015). For example, in Cite, Lopes, Salvoes, and Miners’ (2010) study on the relationship between emotional intelligence and leadership emergence, leadership emergence was peer rated using five items from the Conger-Kananga leadership scale (i.e. “The person had vision and often brought up ideas about possibilities for the future”; Conger & Kanungo, 1994; Conger, Kanungo, & Menon, 2000). Another scale that has been recently validated for its reliability (Foti & Hauenstein, 2007) would be the General Leadership Impression scale (i.e. “How much did I contribute to the effectiveness of my group’s task?”; Lord, Foti, & Vader, 1984).

**Leadership Effectiveness**

Generally, measures of leadership effectiveness are more focused on an individual’s normative performance (Lanaj & Hollenbeck, 2015). The most appropriate method to measure leadership effectiveness is through team, group, or organizational performance. However, these dependent variables would constantly be contaminated since other unanticipated events can happen to influence the outcome of an individual’s actions, thus interrupting his/her hard work (Hogan, Curphy, & Hogan, 1994). That said, how is leadership effectiveness related to team performance? Hallam and Campbell (1992) pointed out eight leadership difficulties that influence team performance; six of which are task related while the remaining two problems concern team maintenance. In relation to team performance, effective leaders put across a clear sense of purpose to the team, recognize existing resources and talent, grow that talent, strategize and organize, direct work tasks, and attain required resources. In relation to team maintenance, effective leaders lessen and end disagreements
among team members and they make sure that team members recognize the
team's aims, limitations, resources, and difficulties (Hallam & Campbell, 1992).

One traditional measure of leadership effectiveness is the Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ) (i.e. “I act as the spokesman of the group.”; Stogdill, 1963). This comprehensive 100-item measure consists of twelve subscales – representation, demand reconciliation, tolerance of uncertainty, persuasiveness, initiation of structure, tolerance and freedom, role assumption, consideration, production emphasis, predictive accuracy, integration, and superior orientation. Another noteworthy measure of leadership effectiveness would be the Empowering Leadership Questionnaire (ELQ) (i.e. “Sets high standards for performance by his/her own behaviour”; Arnold, Arad, Rhoades, & Drasgow, 2000). This scale was designed with the recognition that many corporations have come to substitute traditional hierarchical organizational structures with self-managing teams. There are five dimensions to the 38-item ELQ – leading by example, participative decision-making, coaching, informing, and showing concern/interacting with the team.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Leadership Emergence</th>
<th>Leadership Effectiveness</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Definition</strong></td>
<td>Ability of an individual to exercise considerable influence over other team members even when holding no formal leadership positions (Schneider &amp; Goktepe, 1983).</td>
<td>Most appropriately operationalised in terms of team performance (Hogan, Curphy, &amp; Hogan, 1994).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Descriptive perceptions of an outstanding individual in a team setting (Kaiser, Hogan, &amp; Craig, 2008).</td>
<td>Normative perceptions of agreement with an individual’s leadership performance (Kaiser, Hogan, &amp; Craig, 2008).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Key predictor</strong></td>
<td>Cognitive ability (Foti and Hauenstein, 2007)</td>
<td>Personality (Foti and Hauenstein, 2007)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Assessment method</strong></td>
<td>Leaderless group discussion (Ensari, Riggio, Christian, &amp; Carlslaw, 2011)</td>
<td>Leader Behavior Description Questionnaire (LBDQ; Stogdill, 1963)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Conger-Kanungo leadership scale (Conger &amp; Kanungo, 1994; Conger, Kanungo, &amp; Menon, 2000)</td>
<td>Empowering Leadership Questionnaire (ELQ; Arnold, Arad, Rhoades, &amp; Drasgow, 2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>General Leadership Impression scale (Lord, Foti, &amp; Vader, 1984)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Other Correlates Studied in Leadership Research

**Personality traits.** Initially, the relationship between personality and leadership perceptions were construed as insignificant (Stogdill, 1948; Mann, 1959). More recently, however, researchers have found that these reviews have been interpreted too negatively, and that there is indeed some association between personality and leadership perceptions (Lord, De Vader, & Alliger, 1986). In fact, research from different facets of psychology has been conducted to support the existence of this relationship. From the social-cognitive perspective, studies on implicit learning theories (ILTs) suggest that an individual's leadership perceptions are predicted by his or her conceptualization of personality traits (Lord, De Vader, & Alliger, 1986). On the other hand, research using categorization theory in social psychology has demonstrated that in many situations, there are traits that are characteristic of leaders (Lord, Foti, & Vader, 1984).

In relation to leadership emergence, Gough (1987) found that co-worker and staff ratings for leadership emergence are significantly associated with the scales measuring dominance, capacity for status, sociability, social presence, self-acceptance, achievement via independence, and empathy of the California Psychological Inventory. Similar associations have also been concluded in Stogdill’s (1974) review, where it was reported that leadership emergence is correlated to measures of dominance, extraversion, sociability, ambition or achievement, responsibility, integrity, self-confidence, mood and emotional control, diplomacy, and cooperativeness, all of which are personality descriptors that map onto Goldberg’s big-five model of personality structure (Lord, De Vader, & Alliger, 1986). With regards to ratings of leadership effectiveness, the review concluded that it is positively associated with trait surgency, emotional stability, conscientiousness, and agreeableness (Stogdill, 1974). A review conducted by Judge, Bono, Ilies, and Gerhardt (2002) concluded that leadership emergence and leadership effectiveness are respectively strongly (r = .53) and moderately (r = .39) correlated with the Big-Five Personality model. And when taken together, the Big-Five model has been found to moderately correlated with leadership (r = .48), thus providing support for the leader trait perspective (Judge, Bono, Ilies, & Gerhardt, 2002).

**Intelligence.** In a study investigating cognitive ability and personality traits as antecedents to leadership emergence, Taggar, Hackett, and Saha (1999) found that leadership emergence had the strongest association with cognitive ability (g), followed by personality attributes of conscientiousness, extraversion, and emotional stability. The correlation between intelligence and leadership emergence and effectiveness has also been supported by Foti and Hauenstein (2007). Research has also found that emotional intelligence is associated with leadership emergence, after controlling for the influence of cognitive ability, personality attributes, and gender. Amongst the different dimensions of emotional intelligence (i.e., ability to perceive emotions, ability to use emotions, ability to ability to understand emotions, and ability to manage emotions) leadership emergence is most reliably linked to the ability to understand emotions (Côté, Lopes, Salovey, & Miners, 2010).
Self-related concepts. Apart from personality traits, leadership emergence and effectiveness have been found to correlate with an individual's self-related concepts. For example, research has found that persons with high self-monitoring levels tend to be nominated more often as leaders (i.e. possess higher leadership emergence) when compared with persons with low self-monitoring levels (Foti & Hauenstein, 2007; Dobbins, Long, Dedrick, & Clemons, 1990; Ellis & Cronshaw, 1992), and this relationship persists regardless of the nature of the situation or problem (Foti & Hauenstein, 2007; Zaccaro, Foti, & Kenny, 1991; Hall, Workman, & Marchioro, 1998). This positive association is also apparent when it comes to leadership effectiveness; individuals high in self-monitoring tend more to be rated as effective leaders as compared to individuals low in self-monitoring (Foti & Hauenstein, 2007; Day, Schleicher, Unckless, & Hiller, 2002). This is because persons with higher self-monitoring levels have greater tendency to manage others' impressions of them by winning their approval (Gangestad & Snyder, 2000), thus leading to higher ratings of leadership emergence and effectiveness.

Another self-related concept that has been widely studied in relation to leadership is the concept of self-efficacy. The term self-efficacy can be defined as an individual's personal expectation to successfully carry out behaviors needed for an anticipated result for a particular task (Bandura, 1982). A study conducted by Smith and Foti (1998) found that the self-related concept of general self-efficacy predicts leadership emergence (Smith & Foti, 1998). Related to the concept of self-efficacy is self-esteem – an individual's total evaluation of his/her worth (Blascovich & Tomaka, 2013). In a meta-analytic study of 45 publications, Ensari, Riggio, Christian, and Carslaw (2011) found that self-related concepts of self-efficacy and self-esteem predict leadership evaluations. In addition, they found that these relationships are moderated by gender, such that the relationships are stronger for men than women.

The relationship between leadership performance and locus of control has also been explored in research. Locus of control can be defined as a person’s beliefs about ways in which their own actions, luck, and influential others control what happens in their lives (Levenson, 1973; Presson, Clark, & Benassi, 1997; Rotter, 1966). A study carried out by Anderson and Schneier (1978) on college students found that participants who were chosen as leaders possessed a more internal locus of control when compared with participants who were not and those who emerged as leaders were also characterized by a more internal locus of control than their group's average member. The authors also found that these leaders and their groups outperformed external leaders and their groups respectively (Anderson & Schneier, 1978). These findings suggest that the way in which an individual attributes reasons to outcomes can play a significant role in determining leadership emergence and effectiveness.

Optimism. Leadership emergence and effectiveness may also be associated with optimism. When it comes to performance, optimists have a better ability to manage stressors that may present themselves en route to successful performance (Scheier, Weintraub, & Carver, 1986). Additionally, persons who possess a positive attributional style also have a greater tendency to make
improvements after being unsuccessful (Seligman, Nolen-Hoeksema, Thorton, & Thorton, 1990). However, in a study looking at dispositional affect and leadership effectiveness, Chemers, Watson, and May (1998) found that optimistic cadets were perceived by their military science professors to have greater potential for successful leadership, but their optimism was not predictive of leadership performance. This suggests that optimism may play a more important role in leadership when motivation needs to be sustained through positive expectancies across a longer period of time (Chemers, Watson, & May, 2000).

Figure 1. Correlates of leadership emergence and leadership effectiveness.

Proactive personality. Leadership performance is also expected to be associated with proactive personality. Proactive personality, or personal initiative, refers to an active and self-starting approach to workplace goals and persistence in tackling obstacles and difficulties (Frese & Fay, 2001). With regards to leadership emergence, Bateman and Crant (1993) found that scores on the proactive scale is positively associated with peer nominations of transformational leaders, implying a positive correlation between leadership emergence and proactive personality. They also found proactive personality to be positively related to extraversion, conscientiousness, need for achievement, and need for dominance, all of which are also related to leadership emergence as
explained in an earlier section (Bateman & Crant, 1993). This further supports the relationship between leadership emergence and proactive personality. We would also expect proactive personality to be positively associated with leadership effectiveness since they are both positively correlated with extraversion and conscientiousness.

**REFLECTION**

Although prior research suggests that factors such as dominant or extraverted personality traits, intelligence, self-efficacy, self-esteem, and proactive personality influence leadership effectiveness and leadership emergence, we argue that reflection might offer another more inward-oriented pathway to leadership. In this literature review, we aim to promote a view of leadership as an ongoing process of self-development, learning and growth, one that is facilitated through a consistent practice of introspective reflection.

**Defining reflection**

One of the earliest conceptualizations of reflection was by John Dewey (1933) where reflection is described as a dynamic, continuous, and cautious consideration of any belief or kind of knowledge in its context and the deduction that follows. However, the framework of reflection is anything but straightforward. First, there is more than one domain to reflection. In Luttenberg, Oolbekink-Marchand, and Meijer’s (2017) attempt to consolidate the framework of reflection in teacher action research, the authors distinguished four domains of reflection – scientific, technical, artistic, and moral/ethical reflection, based on traditions described by Coldron and Smith (1999). Here, the different domains of reflection help answer different questions. Scientific reflection answers questions about what is true, technical reflection answers questions about effective and efficient methods and solutions, artistic reflection answers questions about what is good, and moral reflection answers questions about what is fair (Coldron and Smith, 1999; Luttenberg, Oolbekink-Marchand, and Meijer, 2017). Two dimensions were further identified. The justification-application dimension distinguishes between more theoretical (justification) and more personal and real-world (application) reflections. On the other hand, the knowledge-action dimension differentiates between value-free objective knowledge (knowledge) and value-related subjective knowledge (value) (Luttenberg, Oolbekink-Marchand, & Meijer, 2017).
Figure 2. Dimensions and domains of reflection in action research. Recreated from Luttenberg, Oolbekkink-Marchang, and Meijer (2017, p. 4).

While Luttenberg, Oolbekkink-Marchang, and Meijer’s (2017) research is based more in the teaching and education context, Taylor’s (2000, 2004) study of reflection is centered more on the nursing and health care context. In Taylor’s (2000) view, reflective processes come in three forms – technical, emancipatory, and practical reflection. Somewhat similar to Luttenberg, Oolbekkink-Marchang, and Meijer’s (2017) description of technical reflection, technical reflection here requires practical knowledge, reason, the scientific method, analytical thinking, and problem solving. On the other hand, practical reflection involves experiencing a past incident, interpreting the meaning behind a social action, and learning from the incident. Emancipatory reflection goes further by reaching a transformative action through constructing and deconstructing an event, confronting a specific part of the event, and then finally reconstructing the event by introducing strategies to achieve changes given the new insights gained (Taylor, 2000).

Table 2. Types of reflection.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of reflection</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>Reflection that answers questions about effective and efficient methods and solutions (Luttenberg, Oolbekkink-Marchand, &amp; Meijer, 2017) Reflection that requires practical knowledge, reason, the scientific method, analytical thinking, and problem solving (Taylor, 2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scientific</td>
<td>Reflection that answers questions about what is true (Luttenberg, Oolbekkink-Marchand, &amp; Meijer, 2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Artistic</td>
<td>Reflection that answers questions about what is good (Luttenberg, Oolbekkink-Marchand, &amp; Meijer, 2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moral/ethical</td>
<td>Reflection that answers questions about what is fair (Luttenberg, Oolbekkink-Marchand, &amp; Meijer, 2017)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Practical</td>
<td>Reflection that involves experiencing a past incident, interpreting the meaning behind a social action, and learning from the incident (Taylor, 2000)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emancipatory</td>
<td>Reflection that constructs and deconstructs an event, confronts a specific part of the event, and then finally reconstructs the event by introducing strategies to achieve changes given the new insights gained (Taylor, 2000)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Although quite a few forms of reflection have been briefly introduced (and this list is by no means exhaustive), practical reflection is the most common reflection method used in current organizational research. This is suggested by the vast amount of research conducted to investigate the relationship between reflection and learning in workplace settings, as we will see in a section below.

**Reflection-in-action.** Some scholars distinguish between two forms of reflection – *reflection-on-action* and *reflection-in-action*. The conceptualization of *reflection-in-action* was first introduced by Schön (1983) in his work titled *The Reflective Practitioner: How Professionals Think in Action*. In explaining the idea of reflection-in-action, the author first introduced the term *knowing-in-action*, which refers to actions, acknowledgements, and decisions made based on tacit knowledge. In other words, the individual’s know-how is demonstrated by on-the-spot application of knowledge in the action without any prior consideration. On a similar note, reflection-in-action refers to reflecting about the action while the action is being carried out (Schön, 1983). Therefore, reflection-in-action is different from *reflection-on-action* – what we would commonly envision or expect reflection to be, the kind of thinking that occurs only after the action is completed.

Crucial to reflection-in-action is the element of surprise. According to Schön (1983), reflection-in-action is a response prompted by the experience of positive or negative surprises when an intuitive performance is carried out. This process would entail focusing on the action’s results, the action itself, and the tacit knowledge embedded in the action (Schön, 1983). This experience of surprise, however, needs to be more clearly examined and defined as can be suggested by Johnston and Fell’s (2017) study of reflection-in-action as a collective process, where it was found that in the context of group negotiation, learners’ need for reflection is prompted by emerging realisations rather than surprise.

Seibert (1999) further introduced five conditions that promote reflection-in-action in the work environment – autonomy to structure one’s own work where appropriate, feedback on outcomes of one’s actions, interactions with other people, promotive and directive pressure, and momentary solitude. He also suggested that these conditions could be cultivated by personalizing these five reflection conditions, applying these conditions to the current assignment and, routinely re-evaluating these conditions (Seibert, 1999).

**Reflection and Learning**

The process of reflection plays a significant role in learning. Reflection can be perceived as a process that starts with a disturbance in the standard way of managing a particular task. However, such disturbances or uncertainties do not potentially threaten learning, they instead create opportunities for creative learning (Dewey, 1933).

**Experiential learning.** In Kolb’s (1984) theory of experiential learning, reflection on experiences is described as an essential component of learning. Here, learning
is represented as a cyclical process involving four stages that provides an experience its meaning and purpose: (1) coming across a concrete experience; (2) reflective observation; (3) abstract conceptualization and; (4) active experimentation (Kolb, 1984). Experiential learning through reflection has also been shown to occur in workplace settings (Hetzner, Heid, and Gruber, 2015; Tynjälä, 2008; Kauffeld, Grote, and Henschel, 2007). To this end, Kauffeld and colleagues (2007) implemented a competence-reflection inventory (known as the Kompetenz-Reflexions-Inventar (KRI)), where reflection refers to an individual looking back to study their own experiences and actions at the workplace and coming up with new approaches for future actions (Kauffeld, Grote, & Henschel, 2007). In a thematic review conducted on workplace learning, it has been summarized that professionals learn at work by carrying out the task itself, collaborating and speaking with co-workers, working with clients, solving difficult and novel tasks, and reflecting on and assessing their own work experiences (Tynjälä, 2008). This form of reflection is encouraged by an individual’s generalised self-efficacy, personal initiative, and sense of psychological safety among his or her colleagues (Hetzner, Heid, & Gruber, 2015). This perceived sense of psychological safety is in turn made up of support from peers and supervisors in difficult circumstances, complete information flow that helps important discussions, and supervisors’ responses to complications and failures (Seifried & Höpfer, 2013).

Similarly, reflective practice is closely associated with the notion of learning from experience, which in turn involves the following: (1) blending theory and practice; (2) active learning; (3) participative learning and; (4) challenging dogma (Thompson & Pascal, 2012). However, the definition of reflective practice can be depicted by four paradigms (i.e., appropriation, transformation, publication, and conventionalisation) and there has been a paradigm shift in defining reflective practice and models explaining it (Finlayson, 2015). Finlayson (2015) thus suggests that reflective practice has a dynamic definition that can be subjected to personal interpretation to cater to the need of the individual who is carrying out reflective practice. While Schön’s (1983) model includes reflection-in-action and reflection-on-action, Thompson and Pascal (2012) suggests an additional reflection-for-action - ‘the process of planning, thinking ahead about what is to come, so that we can draw on our experience (and the professional knowledge base implicit within in) in order to make the best use of the time resources available to us’.

Mindful engagement. One form of experiential learning through reflection would be the mindful engagement process. Before delving deeper into the concept of mindful engagement, let us first look at related ideas of mindfulness and mindful learning. Mindfulness refers to a state of mind in which an individual concentrates on the present moment’s experience without any form of judgment (Kabat-Zinn, 1994; Marlatt & Kristeller, 1999). The four skills of mindfulness that can be practiced are: (1) mindful observation of internal and external occurrences; (2) acting with awareness by being fully engaged in the present task, (3) mindful description by labelling observations without judgement and; (4) acceptance of present experiences without judgement (Baer, Smith, & Allen, 2004; Dimidjian & Linehan, 2003; Linehan, 1993). Mindful learning can be
defined as the process of making distinctions and observing novel things actively, and it is a way to make sure that our minds remain active and that we stay engaged. The advantages of mindful learning are that it allows danger to be avoided and present opportunities to be seized (Langer, 2000).

![Diagram of The Mindful Engagement Process](image)

**Figure 3. The Mindful Engagement Process. Recreated from Ashford and DeRue (2012, p. 149).**

As depicted in the figure above, mindful engagement refers to “a process for how individuals can approach their experiences, go through their experiences, and reflect on their experiences in ways that enhance the lessons of experience” (Ashford & DeRue, 2012).

In Ashford and DeRue’s (2012) of mindful engagement in relation to leadership development, it is crucial to approach experiences with a learning orientation instead of a performance orientation (the concept of goal orientation will be elaborated in a later section).

The *action* aspect of the process refers to three practices that facilitates real-time experiential learning and these practices are: (1) active experimentation, (2) feedback seeking and, (3) emotion regulation. Active experiment involves performing actions that help rehearse what the individual is trying to learn. Feedback seeking refers to asking for feedback from others with regards to their leadership and its efficacy. Emotion regulation means having the ability to prevent emotional states from becoming too positive or negative so that learning from experience is not hindered.

Lastly, *reflection* here refers to an active process of questioning cause-and-effect, examining assumptions, and studying the significance of experiences. Reflection involves first creating an accurate account of the experience, then considering alternative outcomes if other actions were taken instead, and finally identifying new leadership insights and how they can improve future performance.
**Table 3. Process of Mindful Engagement. Recreated from Ashford and DeRue (2012, p. 152)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Phases</th>
<th>Purpose</th>
<th>Critical Activities</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Approach** | Commit to a learning mindset | • Embrace a learning orientation  
• Set learning goals  
• Plan possible experiments |
| **Action** | Create and capitalize on learning opportunities | • Active experimentation  
• Feedback seeking  
• Emotion regulation |
| **Reflection** | Capture the lessons of experience | • Diagnose cause-and-effect and reconstruct actual experience  
• Consider counterfactuals  
• Distill lessons learned |

**Learning from successes and failures.** Systematic reflection refers to a learning procedure when learners study and understand their behaviour and evaluate how their behaviour have influenced the respective performance outcomes. By carrying out systematic reflection, individuals can learn from both their successes and failures (Ellis, Carette, Anseel, & Lievens, 2014). The outcome is improved subsequent performance by encouraging individuals to study their past experiences through internal and specific attributions (Ellis, Mendel, & Nir, 2006). Ellis and Davidi (2005) also found that compared to mental models of successful events, those of failed events are richer. That said, mental models after reflecting on both failed and successful events are richer than those of failed events only.

One form of systematic reflection would be after-event reviews (AER). According to Ellis and Davidi (2005), AER can be defined as ‘an organizational learning procedure that gives learners an opportunity to systematically analyse their behaviour and to be able to evaluate the contribution of its various components to performance outcomes’. Consistent with the previous section on mental models, Ellis and Davidi (2005) also found that improvement in performance is significant following AERs looking at both successful and failed events, compared to after AERs of only failed events.

Individuals’ learning experience also depends on the type of AER carried out. After a failure, all types of AERs improve subsequent performance, with success-focused AER being less effective. After a success, only failure-focused AER and failure- and success-focused AER improve subsequent performance (Ellis, Mendel, & Nir, 2006).
Reflection in Team Settings

Reflection can also occur at a team or group level. Team reflexivity was initially defined as the degree to which members of a group openly reflect on and discuss about the group’s aims and approaches, and alter them to present or future situations (West, 2000). More recent literature emphasize the element of information processing when defining the construct (Schippers, Edmondson, & West, 2014). In Schippers, Edmondson, and West’s (2014) model of information-processing failures and team reflexivity, the authors organize these failures into three classes – failure to (a) look for and share information, (b) explain and examine information and, (c) review and update conclusions. They argue that these failures could be mitigated by team reflexivity through discussion and assessment of the implications that team information can have for team objectives, approaches, and results (see Figure 4. for Schippers, Edmondson, and West’s (2014) model of information-processing failures and remedies fostering team reflexivity).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Information-processing failures/areas of reflection</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Remedies fostering reflexivity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| SEARCHING/SHARING                                    | Failure to search for and share information  
- Common knowledge effect  
- Hidden profile effect  
- Representational gaps  
- Motivated information sharing | Assuring useful, relevant, and correct information  
- Giving the team more time to discuss  
- Access to informational records during discussion  
- Instructing team members not to form a priori judgments  
- Framing the task as a problem to be solved  
- Assigning roles associated with the information distribution  
- Having a norm to reflect |}
| ELABORATING/ANALYZING                                | Failure to elaborate on and analyse information  
- Framing  
- Heuristics  
- Positive illusions | Explicit information processing  
- Grounded in data  
- Offered as disconfirmable statements  
- Balance advocacy and inquiry |}
| REVISING/UPDATING                                    | Failure to revise and update conclusions  
- Habitual routines  
- Social entrainment  
- Escalation of commitment  
- Confirmation bias | Explicit attention to the team’s decision-making process, and potential disconfirming information  
- Interruption  
- Time-out  
- Process accountability |}

Figure 4. A taxonomy of information-processing failures and remedies fostering team reflexivity. Recreated from Schippers, Edmondson, and West (2014, p. 738).
Evidence has also been found showing team reflexivity’s positive impact on team performance (Gabelica, Van den Bossche, Maeyer, Segers, & Gijselaers, 2014; Dayan & Basarir, 2010). For example, Gabelica and colleagues (2014) found that guided reflexivity could help realize the learning potential that comes with team feedback, thus encouraging teams to profit from prior experiences and produce better performance.

**TIME ORIENTATION**

Although reflection is typically associated with cognitions about the past, a large body of research suggests that reflection might involve both retrospective thoughts about the past and prospective thoughts about the future. This literature also suggests that the time orientation of one’s reflection – whether it is oriented to the past or the future – might have important implications for one’s subsequent thoughts, feelings and behaviour. Subsequently, we argue that the time orientation of one’s reflection might further influence one’s leadership effectiveness or emergence.

**Temporal Focus**

The term *temporal focus* can be defined as the ‘allocation of attention to the past, present, and future’ (Shipp, Edwards, & Lambert, 2009). Temporal focus and distance have the ability to influence the valence of thoughts. Thoughts about the future are more positive, more neutral, and less negative than thoughts about the past. Additionally, thoughts about the near past and future are more negative, more neutral, and less positive (Spronken, Holland, Figner, & Dijksterhuis, 2016). Individuals also tend to adopt a more observer visual perspective (compared to field perspective) for temporally distant events (D’Argembeau & Van der Linden, 2004).

When it comes to valence and temporal distance of events, positive events (as compared to negative events) and temporally close events (as compared to temporally distant events) are represented with more details and elicited greater feelings of re-experiencing and pre-experiencing. The valence of a past event can also determine the ease of recall, with positive events (as compared to negative events) taking less time, but only when these events are of enough importance to the individual’s current self-views (D’Argembeau & Van der Linden, 2004).

One interesting finding is the cultural difference in temporal focus. Guo, Ju, Spina, and Zhang (2012) found that European Canadians experience temporal value asymmetry effect where the future is valued more than the past, while Chinese experience the reverse. However, when primed to focus on the future (past), Chinese (European Canadians) valued the future (past) more than the past (future), indicating that the cultural difference in value asymmetry effect can be explained by temporal focus (Guo, Ji, Spina, & Zhang, 2012). Therefore, when studying the process of reflection, it is important to take into consideration that the content of individuals’ reflection may vary due to Eastern-Western differences in temporal focus.
Madey and Gilovich (1993) have a slightly different definition of temporal focus. They defined temporally focused expectations as outcomes that are expected to occur at a specific point in time that is known beforehand, while temporally unfocused expectations are defined as expectations that are not fixed to any one time point. Therefore, they argue that temporal focus requires mental processing and effort. Madey and Gilovich (1993) found that when expectations are temporally unfocused, there is better recall for consistent information than for inconsistent information. However, when expectations are temporally focused, the recall for consistent and inconsistent information is more equal. This suggests that the difference in recall can be attributed to how much processing is devoted to consistent and inconsistent events under the different temporal focus conditions (Madey & Gilovich, 1993).

Retrospective and Prospective Cognitions

According to Schacter, Addis, and Buckner (2008), simulating possible future events as well as remembering past events both rely on largely the same neural machinery. Episodic simulation processes such as planning, prediction, and remembering intentions make up “the prospective brain,” whose main purpose is to utilize past experiences to forecast future events (Schacter, Addis, & Buckner, 2008).

That said, other studies have found differences in cognitions about the past versus cognitions about the future. A study conducted in consumer research found that retrospective thoughts are more contextually detailed than anticipatory thoughts when there is an absence of external detail (Krishnamurthy & Sujan, 1999). Moreover, another study found that anticipation about positive, negative, routine, and hypothetical emotional events evoke more intense emotions when compared with retrospection and this relationship is mediated by the inclination to mentally simulate future emotional events more extensively than past events (Van Boven & Ashworth, 2007). Relatedly, it has been found that self-reflection encourages prospective bias during mind-wandering, resulting in more frequent future than past thoughts, especially when the individual is engaged in a task that does not need continuous monitoring (Smallwood, Nind, & O’Connor, 2009; Smallwood et al., 2011).

The sections below will review the literatures on prospective cognitions (e.g., future orientation, future-oriented thinking, possible selves) and retrospective cognitions (e.g., past orientation, past-oriented thinking, past selves).

Future Orientation. The conceptualization of future orientation was first demonstrated by Kastenbaum (1961), when he found that several different indicators of time perspective all loaded on a factor he termed as the ‘general concern for future events’. As summarized in Trommsdorf (1983), future orientation is composed of two main aspects – cognitive as well as motivational and affective. Cognitively, future orientation refers to the organizing of future events in temporal and causal order. Affectively, future orientation can be
optimistic or pessimistic. Motivationally, future orientation can form the core of driven activity (Nuttin, 1964).

**Future-oriented Thinking.** Future-oriented thoughts take place often in natural settings and have different representational formats, thematic contents, and purposes (D’Argembeau, Renaud, & Van der Linden, 2011). According to Szpunar, Spreng, and Schacter’s (2014) taxonomy of prospective cognition (see Figure 5. below), future thinking can be organized into four modes of thinking that may form dynamic relationships with each other - simulation, prediction, intention, and planning. Here, simulation refers to the building of a comprehensive mental representation of the future, prediction refers to the approximation of the chances of and/or response to a future event, intention refers to mentally setting a target, and planning refers to the recognition and structuring of steps to achieve a target (Szpunar, Spreng, & Schacter, 2014). The authors also suggest that prospective cognition can also be placed on an episodic-semantic continuum, where the content of the future thought also depends on whether the knowledge involved is more semantic (general and abstract) or episodic (specific to an event) (Szpunar, Spreng, & Schacter, 2014). It has also been found that the different modes of future thinking have varying influence on performance. In Oettingen and Mayer’s (2002) study of the motivating function of future-oriented thinking, the authors found that positive expectations, what would be described as positive predictions by Szpunar, Spreng, and Schacter (2014), result in more effort and successful performance, while positive fantasies, what would be described as positive simulations, result in less effort and less successful performance.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>SIMULATION</th>
<th>PREDICTION</th>
<th>INTENTION</th>
<th>PLANNING</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EPISODIC</td>
<td>Construction of a mental representation of a specific autobiographical future event.</td>
<td>Estimation of the likelihood of and/or one’s reaction to a specific autobiographical future event.</td>
<td>Setting a goal in relation to a specific autobiographical future event.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction of a mental representation of a non-specific autobiographical state.</td>
<td>Estimation of the likelihood of and/or one’s reaction to a non-specific future autobiographical state.</td>
<td>Setting a non-specific autobiographical future goal.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Construction of a mental representation of a general or abstract state of the world.</td>
<td>Estimation of the likelihood of and/or one’s reaction to a general or abstract future state of the world.</td>
<td>Setting a general or abstract goal, such as the goal of an organization.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Figure 5. A taxonomy of prospective cognition. Recreated from Szpunar, Spreng, and Schacter (2014, p. 18415).*
However, while prospection allows the preview and prefeeling of events, errors may arise when prefeelings are used to make predictions about future feelings. These errors happen when simulations are unrepresentative, essentialized, abbreviated, and decontextualized (Gilbert & Wilson, 2007).

Possible selves. The concept of possible selves was first introduced by Markus and Nurius in 1986 and it refers to the representation of individuals’ thoughts of what they might possibly become, what they aspire to become, and what they fear of becoming. While possible selves involve representations of the self in the future that are specific and individually significant, they also come from representations of the self in the past. These individualized possible selves can also have a social origin and be derived from social comparisons with salient others. Possible selves can also be past selves if these past selves characterize the individual again in the future (Markus & Nurius, 1986).

Additionally, the idea of possible selves also supports the association between cognition and motivation (Markus & Nurius, 1986). According to Hoyle and Sherrill (2006), consistent with a control-process model of self-regulation, possible selves are a source of behavioural standards that have effect on current behaviour. Possible selves are also a source of implicit behavioural standards that are associated with relational value (Hoyle & Sherrill, 2006). This important relationship could possibly explain Ruvolo and Markus’s (1992) findings, where participants who imagined successful possible selves worked the longest on the given task and yielded the highest performance.

Past orientation. Past orientation refers to directing attention to one’s past life events and experiences. While many researchers have investigated future-oriented concepts such as future orientation, future-oriented thinking and possible selves, much less has been written about past-oriented concepts. This research gap was first addressed by Zimbardo and Boyd (1999) in a study conducted to implement a new metric measuring time perspective as an individual difference. Out of the five factors representing different time perspectives, the authors identified two that were related to past orientation – past-negative and past-positive. The past-negative factor here refers to a ‘pessimistic, negative, or aversive attitude toward the past’. On the other hand, the past-positive factor refers to a ‘glowing, nostalgic, positive construction of the past’ (Zimbardo & Boyd, 1999).

Past-oriented thinking. While there has been much research examining the various aspects of retrospection (i.e. autobiographical memory, recall), there currently exists no framework summarizing different forms of retrospection. One form of retrospection that may be especially relevant in our study of reflection would be reminiscence.

Reminiscence refers to the recall of one’s past self (Bluck & Levine, 1998). A good preview of the various forms of reminiscence and some of their functions would be Cappeliez and O’Rourke’s (2006) empirical model illustrating the relationship between reminiscence and well-being of older adults. Here, reminiscence is represented by three latent constructs that further encompass eight functions:
self-positive functions such as identity, problem-solving, and death preparation; self-negative functions such as bitterness revival, boredom reduction, and intimacy maintenance; and prosocial functions such as conversation and teaching or informing others (Cappeliez & O’Rourke, 2006). Haight and Webster (1995) wrote a comprehensive review of the literature concerning the study of reminiscence and its functions.

Another possible form of retrospection would be nostalgia – an individual’s sentimental longing for his or her past (Sedikides, Wildschut, Arndt, & Routledge, 2008). Nostalgic narratives generally represent more positive than negative affect, and is usually triggered by negative mood and loneliness. Nostalgia also serve key psychological functions by strengthening social bonds, improving self-regard, and producing positive feelings (Wildschut, Sedikides, Arndt, & Routledge, 2006). Interestingly, nostalgia may also have a physiological function and increase physical warmth when an individual is triggered by coldness (Zhou, Chen, Wildschut, Sedikides, & Vingerhoets, 2012).

Past selves. Individuals also engage in temporal comparisons using memories of past selves since knowledge related to past selves is associated with the current self (Albert, 1977). According to Wilson and Ross’ (2001) theory of self-appraisal, individuals can preserve their generally positive self-regard by criticizing distant and commending recent past selves, especially on traits that are perceived to be important. The authors found that individuals are generally more critical of distant than of current selves, even when the current selves are no better than the past selves (Wilson & Ross, 2001).

Such self-enhancing tendencies may serve as a coping mechanism triggered by stressful events. Compared to their acquaintances, McFarland and Alvaro (2000) found that victims of traumatic life events perceive greater improvement in personality after these events than after less negative life events by criticizing their personalities prior to these traumatic life events. They also found that this stronger perception of improvement is caused by threatening or negative self-relevant feelings (McFarland & Alvaro, 2000).

That said, how past selves are evaluated also depends on the individual’s motivation to repair negative moods and his or her knowledge structure of personal change (McFarland & Buehler, 2012). Generally, when individuals believe that personality is changeable, they would tend to respond to negative moods (compared to neutral moods) by derogating past selves. However, when individuals think of personality as stable, they would tend to respond to negative moods by idealizing their past selves (McFarland & Buehler, 2012).

However, while past selves may be used as a standard of comparison against the current self, judgments of an individual’s current self may be affected or shaped by the perception of his or her past selves. According to Schwarz and Bless’ (1992) inclusion/exclusion model, these judgments may be influenced by assimilation effects when the recalled information is representative of the current self and by contrast effects when the recalled information is non-representative of the current self. The type of judgmental effect occurring also
depends on the individual’s perceived temporal distance from the past self. The individual would tend to display a contrast effect if the recalled past self is perceived to be temporally distant and an assimilation effect if the recalled past self is perceived to be temporally close (Broemer, Grabowski, Gebauer, Ermel, & Diehl, 2008).

Moreover, past selves do not always have to be perceived as negative in order to improve judgments of current selves. In a study conducted to examine cultural differences in past selves’ relation to current subjective well-being, researchers found that while both Asian and European Americans were happier when they perceived their current selves more positively, Asian Americans, as compared to European Americans, are able to judge their current lives as more favourable when led to perceive their past selves positively (Kim, et al., 2012).

**GOAL ORIENTATION**

Another important dimension upon which individuals’ reflection might vary is goal orientation. When reflecting, some individuals might focus more on performance goals, while others might focus more on learning goals. The literature on goal orientation suggests that one’s goal orientation might have important implications for one’s job performance and other work-related outcomes. Following this logic, we argue that one’s goal orientation might also influence one’s leadership effectiveness or emergence.

**Setting Goals**

There are two major classes of goals – *performance goals* and *learning goals*. Performance goals refer to goals where an individual aims to receive positive evaluations or avoid unfavourable evaluations of their competence, while learning goals refer to goals where an individual aims to improve their competence, to learn or be good at something new or novel to him or her (Dweck, 1986).

Based on Locke and Latham’s (1990) goal setting theory, some people perform better than others even when they are the same in ability and knowledge because of motivational reasons – they have differing performance goals. According to the authors, task performance depends on the goal’s content and intensity, where a more specific and challenging goal leads to better task performance. In workplace settings, a specific and challenging goal focuses an employee’s attention, effort, and persistence to more goal-relevant actions. Such a goal encourages the employee to alter his or her efforts to match the difficulty level of the goal and to persevere until the goal is met. When it comes to complex tasks, goal setting helps in developing strategies to attain the goal (Locke & Latham, 1990).

However, in Kanfer and Ackerman’s (1989) study of motivation and cognitive abilities, it was found that assigning performance goals in the earlier stages of skill acquisition may have a negative impact on task performance, especially for
individuals of lower ability. Additionally, in their proposed framework of information-processing, new and complex tasks require more attention and have less advantage for self-regulatory activities such as self-monitoring, self-evaluation, and self-reactions. On the other hand, goal setting has a stronger effect on performance for simpler tasks because they demand less of the individual’s attention. Therefore, for individuals with lower abilities and in the context of complex tasks, setting performance goals may be more beneficial only in the later stages of skill acquisition (Kanfer & Ackerman, 1989).

On the contrary, learning goals shift an individual’s attention from end results to the discovery of strategies and processes to reach those results (Seijts & Latham, 2005). In fact, when it comes to complex tasks, a meta-analysis conducted to study the performance effects of different motivational states confirmed that learning goals result in better performance as compared to performance goals. This advantage is more significant when the learning goals are moderately pressuring and when there is a presence of others (Utman, 1997).

The observed impact that goal setting has on task performance may be due to the role it plays in influencing an individual's motivation. According to Dweck (1986), there are generally two types of achievement behaviour patterns – the adaptive “mastery-oriented” pattern that seeks challenges and displays high and effective persistence in response to obstacles, and the maladaptive “helpless” pattern that avoids challenges and displays low persistence in response to obstacles. Alongside an individual’s theory of intelligence and confidence in his or her present ability, his or her behavior pattern is also influenced by the type of goal set (Dweck, 1986; Elliot & Dweck, 1988). Generally, individuals who subscribe to entity theory and believe that intelligence is fixed tend to set performance goals and be mastery-oriented if they possess a high confidence of their present ability, but tend to have a helpless behaviour pattern if they possess a low confidence of their present ability. On the other hand, individuals who subscribe to an incremental theory and believe that intelligence is malleable tend to set learning goals and be mastery-oriented regardless of confidence levels in their present ability. Indeed, a review of the current literature posits that factors encouraging learning goals are related to increased intrinsic motivation and factors encouraging performance goals are related to decreased intrinsic motivation (Heyman & Dweck, 1992).

**Goal Orientation**

Goal orientation can be defined as an individual’s goal preferences in achievement conditions (Payne, Youngcourt, & Beaubien, 2007) and accordingly, there are two major classes of goal orientations – performance goal orientation and learning goal orientation (Dweck, 1986). As suggested in the earlier section, the two goal orientations are related to different individual beliefs about intelligence and effort (i.e. implicit person theory). Generally, a learning goal orientation is associated with incremental theory, the personal belief that intelligence can be nurtured and investment more effort can serve as a strategy that hones the ability to successfully perform a task. A performance goal orientation, on the other hand, is associated with entity theory, the personal
belief that intelligence is hard to develop and effort does not play a role in
reaching successful task performance. Since an individual would not be able to
adopt both beliefs simultaneously, goal orientation was initially conceptualized
as a bipolar construct.

Giving the example of competitive divers, Button, Mathieu, and Zajac (1996) later
argued that goal orientation is a two-factor construct. Since competitive divers
often aim to be better than their competitors and their own previous
performance at the same time, the authors posit that individuals can adopt both
learning and performance goal orientations simultaneously (Button, Mathieu, &
Zajac, 1996). However, even more recent studies have found evidence to show
that goal orientation is in fact a three-factor construct (VandeWalle, 1997; Elliot
& Harackiewicz, 1996). Using Heyman and Dweck’s (1992) definition of
performance goal orientation, VandeWalle (1997) validated that there are two
further dimensions to performance goal orientation – proving goal orientation
and avoidance goal orientation. Following are VandeWalle’s (1997) definitions of
the construct’s three dimensions:

1. Learning goal orientation – ‘a desire to develop the self by acquiring new skills,
mastering new situations, and improving one’s competence’
2. Proving goal orientation – ‘the desire to avoid the disproving of one’s
competence and to gain favourable judgments about it’
3. Avoidance goal orientation – ‘the desire to avoid the disproving of one’s
competence and to avoid negative judgments about it’ (p. 1000)

Past research would also suggest that goal orientation can be both a
dispositional trait and a situational state (Button, Mathieu, & Zajac, 1996). In
studies where goal orientation is measured (e.g., Licht & Dweck, 1984; Diener &
Dweck, 1980), goal orientation is assumed to be a stable dispositional trait. On
the other hand, in studies where goal orientation is manipulated (e.g., Elliot &
Dweck, 1988; Diener & Srull, 1979), a state-like characteristic is suggested.

Goal orientation and performance. Goal orientation may influence performance
levels at the workplace. For example, a study examining the relationship
between goal orientation and sales performance found that a learning goal
orientation improves sales performance while a performance goal orientation is
In fact, in Payne, Youngcourt, and Beaubien’s (2007) meta-analytic study of goal
orientation’s nomological net, the authors found high levels of trait and state
learning goal orientation to be beneficial for task and job performance, as is the
case for trait and state proving goal orientation. However, high levels of trait
avoidance goal orientation were found to be associated with lower task and job
performance. The positive association between learning goal orientation and
performance has been found to be fully mediated by self-regulation tactics such
as goal setting, effort, and planning (VandeWalle, Brown, Cron, & Slocum Jr.,
1999). Individuals with a learning goal orientation tend to set more challenging
goals, put in more effort and develop plans for reaching these goals, and these
behaviours are associated with better performance. Since it has been earlier
established that state goal orientation can be manipulated, organizations can
take advantage of these associations to improve their employees’ performance
by encouraging a learning orientation while discouraging an avoidance goal orientation.

Different goal orientations may also produce varying responses to performance feedback on a prior task. VandeWalle, Cron, and Slocum Jr. (2001) found that after receiving performance feedback from a prior task, learning goal orientation remains positively related to subsequent performance, proving goal orientation becomes unrelated to subsequent performance, and avoiding goal orientation remains negatively related to subsequent performance.

**Goal orientation and employment.** Another work-related outcome of goal orientation is its impact on reemployment of unemployed job seekers. A study has found evidence supporting learning goal orientation’s positive effect on reemployment. Generally, state learning goal orientation results in more job search intentions and behaviours, as well as higher chances of being reemployed (van Hooft & Noordzij, 2009). Therefore, adopting the appropriate goal orientation is just as important before entering the workforce as is after entering the workforce.

**Goal orientation and other workplace outcomes.** As earlier elaborated, since the concept of goal orientation is so intertwined with implicit person theory (IPT; i.e. incremental versus entity theory of intelligence and effort), it is important to also consider the effects of IPT at the workplace. Heslin, Latham, and VandeWalle (2005) found that managers with an incremental theory are better able to judge improvement or a drop in performance, without being biased by prior impressions. Fortunately, this relationship is not limited to dispositional incremental theorists only. Managers with an entity theory can be trained to develop a more incremental IPT, leading to better recognition in employees’ performance improvements when compared to untrained entity theorists (Heslin, Latham, & VandeWalle, 2005). These results may possibly explain the finding that managers with a more incremental IPT are perceived to be more procedurally just by their employees, leading to employees displaying more organizational citizenship behaviours (Heslin & VandeWalle, 2009). Taking these findings into consideration, future research may consider investigating the effect that goal orientation has on accuracy of performance appraisals as well as important workplace behaviours such as organizational citizenship behaviours and counterproductive work behaviours.

**CONCLUSION**

Leadership research has primarily focused on explaining leadership emergence and leadership effectiveness from a trait-based perspective. Individual differences, such as personality traits, intelligence, and self-related concepts, have been found to be key predictors of leadership. Leaders are generally those who are dominant, proactive, cognitively intelligent, and self-confident. In this literature review, we introduce a notion of leadership as facilitated by a more inward-oriented, introspective process of individual reflection. In this sense, leadership may be best conceptualized as an ongoing process of self-
development and growth, a process that benefits from individuals’ self-reflection.

Furthermore, we view reflection as a multi-faceted practice. Individuals can reflect on their past experiences (retrospective) and reflect on what might happen in the future (prospective). They can reflect on their learning goals and their desire to acquire new skills, master new situations and improve themselves, as well as reflect on their performance goals and their desire to prove their competence and worth to those around them. In future research, we hope to test the ideas proposed in this paper by empirically exploring whether reflection does indeed benefit leadership emergence and leadership effectiveness, and whether the time orientation (past orientation vs. future orientation) or goal orientation (learning orientation vs. performance orientation) of reflection has any influence on the relationship between reflection and leadership.
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