

ORGANIZATIONAL VIRTUOUSNESS: THE CUSTOMERS' PERSPECTIVE

Joshua Gukiina*, Waswa Balunywa**, Joseph Mpeera Ntayi***, Augustine Ahiauzu****

Abstract: *Purpose: The purpose of the present paper is to review and document prominent organisational virtues scattered in attendant literature so as to facilitate the construction of the concept organisational virtuousness from the perspective of customers for the first time.*

Design/ Methodology/ Approach: This is a thematic review of the most recent articles on organisational virtues that were obtained from the Internet.

Findings: The current conceptual and operational definition of organisational virtuousness is not only deficient of certain dominant virtues, but as well incognizant of the input of customers, who substantially reap from virtue theory at least as alluded to by extant literature.

Research Limitations/ Implications: This paper is theoretical and not empirical. It simply cannot claim to have exhausted all the virtues that there is since virtue theory is still undergoing scholarly metamorphism. Equally, the concepts and their operations have been borrowed from an array of disciplines given the eclectic nature of virtues and as such, they need to be contextualised so as to make them handy for any attendant study.

Originality/ Value: The paper proudly presents a documentation of virtues that are organisational in nature, some of which have not been considered before in the construction of the concept organisational virtuousness. It puts in perspective the fact that virtue theory is equally understood and cherished by customers whose rating does not any longer merit shelving in the wake to the contemporary bells of evolution of virtue theory. Therefore, this paper serves as a renewal of scholarly work on virtue theory.

Keywords: *Organisational Virtuousness, Optimism, Trust, Compassion, Forgiveness, Wisdom, Courage, Justice, Temperance, Transcendence, Commitment, Responsiveness and Innovativeness*

INTRODUCTION

The extolled term organisational virtuousness (OV) is greatly associated with Cameron, Bright, and Caza (2004). It is rooted in the ardent knowledge of the concept virtue whose Latin complement is *virtues* which means “strength” or “excellence” (Arjoon, 2010) and merrily premised in the virtue ethics meadow of philosophy. OV means contextualised excellent qualities such as compassion, integrity, forgiveness, and trust (Cameron *et al.*, 2004). In such a social context, nearly similar-minded people exist to pursue shared objectives which organisational life can provide them after all; they willfully cherish improvement in human suffering (Balliett & Kelloway, 2011). However, as we appreciate evolutionary literature on organisational virtuousness, prominent flaws exist. Firstly, the absence of certain virtues which are organisational in nature such as organisational commitment (Malik, Samina, Basharat, & Rizwan, 2010; Meyer & Allen, 1987), organisational responsiveness (Parasuraman, Zeithaml, & Berry, 1988), and organisational innovativeness (Woodman, Sawyer, &

Griffin, 1993) in the operationalisation of the concept is not explained. Secondly, virtues that merit consideration in the reconstitution of the concept are illogically scattered in marketing and organisation behaviour literature. Thirdly, Cameron *et al.*'s (2004) model of organisational virtuousness retains optimism, trust, compassion, integrity, and forgiveness as its dimensions while that by Peterson and Seligman (2004) and Sosik and Cameron (2010) has wisdom, courage, humanity, justice, temperance, and transcendence. However, to Evans and Reville (2008) and Mayer, Davis, & Schoorman (1995), integrity and competence respectively, are subsumed to be dimensions of trust while humanity is a dimension of compassion (Pommier, 2011). This might signal multicollinearity effects if these current models not checked yet already speciously detached. Fourthly, Gotsis & Grimani (2015) believe that scholarship on organisational virtuousness has historically ignored the perspective of inter-organisational actors such as customers, supply chain managers, and competitors in favour of employees and employers yet; they are part of those that engender virtuousness. This is so far scholarly unfairness.

* Lecturer, Makerere University Business School, Jinja Campus, Department of Marketing and Management, Uganda.
Email: gukiina_gukiina@yahoo.com

** Professor, Makerere University Business School, Uganda.

*** Professor, Makerere University Business School, Faculty of Business Computing, Uganda. Email: jntayius@gmail.com

**** Professor, River State University of Science & Technology, Port Harcourt, Nigeria.

Theoretically, organisational virtuousness is largely rooted in the virtue theory as associated with Aristotle (Crockett, 2005). It posits that individuals possess virtuous traits such as; wisdom, courage, humanity, justice, temperance, and transcendence, optimism, trust, compassion, integrity, and forgiveness (Peterson & Seligman, 2004; Cameron *et al.*, 2004). With these behavioural characteristics, individuals can unceasingly ensure that their organisation becomes virtuous at all costs (Cameron *et al.*, 2004). This is because; such virtuous individual traits can build and shield virtuousness in organisations. At a macro level, organisations can engender virtuousness through the enactment of virtuous practices into their overall strategic plans which make them become characterised as virtuous (Mello, 2011). This is why Caza, Barker, and Cameron (2004) noted earlier that on their own, conscious organisations can formulate institutional frameworks that perpetuate virtuousness. Therefore, just as organisational virtuousness can be explained by individual dispositions, so can organisations on their own because both entities have the ability to set standards of excellence that they can consciously enforce in an effort to permeate virtuousness. The objective of this theoretical paper is twofold: (a) to document those virtues that are organisational in nature so as to facilitate the progressive development of the concept after empirical testing of their associated dimensions and scales, and (b) to suggest that customers in particular might have an alternative version of organisational virtuousness because they have a very significant stake in any organisational business.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Literature on organisational virtues reviewed, is in two forms and these are (i) The literature on virtues that currently operationalise the concept of organisational virtuousness and (ii) Literature on virtues that are organisational in nature but are not part of the current operational definition of the concept organisational virtuousness. Therefore, below is the thematic review under the stated themes and against each virtue is an illustration of its relevance to customers if they are to rate the concept.

Virtues that Currently Operationalise the Concept of Organisational Virtuousness and their Relevance to Customers

The current models of the concept retain optimism, trust, compassion, forgiveness, wisdom, courage, justice, temperance, and transcendence (Cameron *et al.*, 2004; Peterson & Seligman, 2004; Sosik & Cameron, 2010). The review considers these but it reveals that integrity and humanity, formally independent constructs of the same

variable, are now dimensions of trust and compassion respectively.

Optimism

Optimism is both a personality and organisational trait (Carver, Scheier, & Segerstrom, 2010; Prosad, Kapoor, & Sengupta, 2015). It refers to a belief in success regardless of current challenges. It is relevant to customers (Mann, 2014) as Weinstein (1980) long back established that human judgment is biased when estimating personal risk because it is natural for people to overestimate their chances of encountering success. This means that to judge an organisation as being optimistic or not on the basis of employees and employers' held view, is in its own right a scholarly controversy. Therefore, it is still proposed that

Proposition 1: Optimism is a dimension of organisational virtuousness as determined by customers.

Trust

Frost, Simpson, & Mahugan (1978) believe that it is a tendency to have hope in one's behaviour. It retains integrity as a dimension (Evans & Revelle, 2008). It has been studied at a macro level (Lynette, 2009) and it is synonymous with organisational loyalty or organisational reliability. It is relevant to customers (Halliburton & Poenaru, 2010). However, it is true that trust is dynamic because it can increase or decrease, depending on the nature of ongoing interactions between the trustor and trustee (Gautschi, 2002). Therefore, trust is not a constant even in organisational life and until now, it is rather challenging to consider trust as a dimension of organisational virtuousness based on the ratings by employees and employers in their respective organisations. Therefore, it is proposed that:

Proposition 2: Trust is a dimension of organisational virtuousness as determined by the customers.

Compassion

Goetz, Keltner, and Simon-Thomas (2010) look at it as assistance of the weak and those suffering. It is synonymous with organisational empathy. It retains among others, humanity as a dimension (Pommier, 2011). It is equally organisational (Sinclair, Norris, McConnell, Chochinov, Hack, Hagen, McClement, & Bouchal, 2016). It is equally of relevance to customers (Torpier, 2014) however, compassion in the workplace has caused increased organisational financial, psychological, and social costs (Moon, Hur, Ko, Kim, & Yoon, 2015). This is because the organisation normally does a lot to calm down those who are psychologically unstable. Therefore, to retain it as a dimension of organisational

virtuousness after being rated by employees who equally suffer from persistent work related stress, still remains a challenge. We nevertheless propose that:

Proposition 3: Compassion is a dimension of organisational virtuousness as determined by customers.

Forgiveness

Forgiveness refers to the positive responses towards the offender (McCullough, Rachal, Sandage, Worthington, Brown, & Hight, 1998). It is organisational in nature (Law, 2014). It is equally relevant to customers (Joireman, Yany, & Tripp, 2016) however, forgiveness has been found to cause repeated offenses, particularly in organisations which have fair and formal procedures (Exline, Worthington, Hill, & McCullough, 2003). Besides, even when religious prescriptions of forgiveness and compassion exist, people often have difficulty in forgiving others (Witvliet, 2001). Therefore, forgiveness like the case with other dimensions of organisational virtuousness examined, cannot be guaranteed in organisations because employees and supervisors as individuals, may not be forgiving as well. However, it is still proposed that:

Proposition 4: Forgiveness is a dimension of organisational virtuousness as determined by customers.

Wisdom

Meacham (1990) defines it as the awareness of ignorance. It is organisational as well (Baltes & Smith, 2008) where it refers to the managerial cycles through which employees are provided with knowledge (Tack, 1986). This means that when employees are provided with the requisite knowledge, they are enabled to serve the stakeholders better. It is equally important to customers because according to Bagozzi, Frank, and Willem (2010), salespeople work directly with customers and as such, have to maintain good relationships with customers because they act as representatives of their firm. This means that they have to be wise enough to engage the concerns of customers. Therefore, it is proposed that:

Proposition 5: Wisdom is a dimension of organisational virtuousness as determined by customers.

Courage

According to Shelp (1984), courage is the ability to act meaningfully regardless of the fear that it might be costly. This virtue is equally organisational in nature (Cavanagh & Moberg, 1999). Interestingly, courage is equally of relevance to customers because organisations rely on employees to display courage when undertaking their job tasks and interacting with customers, team members and subordinates.

This is why companies that enshrine courage in their sales, customer service, or leadership, are classified as effective and efficient since they insist on a core set of principles (Acclivus, 2014). Therefore, it is proposed that:

Proposition 6: Courage is a dimension of organisational virtuousness as reported by customers.

Justice

Organisationally, it refers to employee perceptions of fairness in the workplace (Brockner, 2010). With organisational justice, employees become more satisfied because they feel that they are fairly rewarded for the work they do (Rupp, 2011). Therefore, they are usually more committed to the organisation and are highly retained and productive (Fatt, Wong, & Heng, 2010). However, because organisations have a limited amount of wealth and resources, the question of how those benefits ought to be distributed frequently becomes a challenge (De Matos, Henrique, & de Rosa, 2013). This makes justice perceptions become contestable. To date, organisational justice is relevant to customers (Smith & Mpinganjira, 2015). Therefore, it is proposed that:

Proposition 7: Justice is a dimension of organisational virtuousness as determined by customers.

Temperance

It is the ability to control impulses, including those that are aggressive (Steinberg & Cauffman, 1996). It is equally organisational in nature (Riggio, 2011). To this extent, organisations need to recruit people who are mentally stable at all times so as to be in position to take decisions that transform them. Temperance is still of relevance to consumers because in a study by Haws, Bearden, and Nenkov (2011), lack of control makes consumers reduce their purchasing power. It is as such proposed that:

Proposition 8: Temperance is a dimension of organisational virtuousness as rated by customers.

Transcendence

This is the quest for perfectionism (Jarzabkowski, Lê, & Van De Ven, 2013). Just as people seek for excellence in all that they do using their own means, so does an organisation (Torabipor & Rekab, 2009). Therefore, transcendence is equally organisational (Smith & Lewis, 2011). It has also been found to be of value to customers because; self-transcendence has a positive relationship with customer satisfaction (Ogunnaike & Kehinde (2011). Therefore, it is proposed that:

Proposition 9: Transcendence is a dimension of organisational virtuousness as determined by customers.

Virtues that are Organisational in Nature but Excluded from the Current Operationalisation and Measurement of the Concept Organisational Virtuousness

The following are prominent organisational virtues that have been neglected in the current operational definition of OV yet they are equally relevant to customers. These include commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1987), responsiveness (Parasuraman *et al.*, 1988), and innovativeness (Woodman *et al.*, 1993).

Commitment

This is both a human and organisational attribute (Malik *et al.*, 2010; Meyer & Allen, 1987). Organisationally, clients feel satisfied with an organisation whose employees are committed (Malik *et al.*, 2010; Meyer & Allen, 1987). Unfortunately, even when both customers and employees of a particular organisation find commitment to be of value, it is important to note that the current operational definition of organisational virtuousness is deficient of commitment as a dimension. Therefore, it is in order that we propose that:

Proposition 10: Commitment is a dimension of organisational virtuousness as determined by customers.

Responsiveness

At the organisational level, it is conceptualised as a firm's likelihood to act based on the known customers' preferences (Hult, David, & Stanley, 2005). It is synonymous with organisational adaptability (Morrison & Hall, 2002). It is of relevance to customers and probably this is why, Parasuraman *et al.* (1988) define responsiveness as the employees' expression of willingness to help customers and provide quick services. This is why, if an organisation wants to be successful, it needs to consider customers preferences and not its own wishes (Zeithaml, Bitner, & Gremler, 2006). Unfortunately, responsiveness is not a current dimension of organisational virtuousness. Therefore, it is proposed that:

Proposition 11: Responsiveness is a dimension of organisational virtuousness as determined by customers.

Innovativeness

At the macro level, it is the formation of superior valuable new products or services within an organisational context (Woodman *et al.*, 1993). Individuals in organisations originate new ideas (Redmond *et al.*, 1993) and this is the basis for organisational innovation (Shalley & Gilson, 2004). The customer then benefits from the innovativeness of employees by accessing new and better quality products.

In this way, the aggregate innovativeness of an organisation as a whole is a virtue that the customer would love to find in an organisation of choice. However, it is not a current dimension of organisational virtuousness as a concept. In this regard, it is proposed that:

Proposition 12: Innovativeness is a dimension of organisational virtuousness as determined by customers.

METHODOLOGY

Relevant articles that were reviewed for this theoretical paper were obtained from a devoted computerised search of Google scholar and PubMed databases using the key words: organisational virtuousness, optimism, trust, compassion, forgiveness, wisdom, courage, justice, temperance, transcendence, commitment, responsiveness, and innovativeness. The choice of these virtues as key terms was guided primarily by earlier scholarly efforts such as Cameron *et al.* (2004), Peterson and Seligman (2004), Sosik and Cameron (2010). The search for those virtues was in two forms: firstly, it was for articles on those virtues that are already constructs of the term organisational virtuousness. These are optimism, trust, compassion, forgiveness, wisdom, courage, justice, temperance, and transcendence. Secondly, it was for articles on those virtues that are organisational in nature but have never been considered in the initial factor structure of the concept organisational virtuousness. These are commitment, responsiveness and innovativeness. From these relevant articles, the meaning of each of the key terms above and its dimensions at both the individual and organisational levels were obtained. We also obtained articles that indicated a significance of these virtues to customers. The purpose was to advance the argument that customers can assess the extent to which any organisation they interact with is virtuous or not so as to construct the concept organisational virtuousness from their own perspective (Gotsis & Grmani, 2015). The total number of articles obtained was 154.

DISCUSSION

Here in is an examination of the dimensionality of each of the virtues at both the individual and organisational levels as viewed by employees and their supervisors. Each virtue examined, ends with a recommendation of those dimensions that could be adopted at the macro level.

Optimism

This is both an individual (Scheier, Carver, & Bridges, 2001; Schweizer, Wolfgang, & Andreas, 2011) and organisational level concept (Beheshtifar, 2013; Gabris, Maclin, & Ihrke, 1998; Fredrickson, 1998). However, studies are sparse regarding the multidimensionality of the concept.

Instead, micro measurement items exist and have simply been extrapolated to measure optimism at a macro level by employees and their supervisors. It is hereby recommended that existing micro measurement items as those adopted by (Beheshtifar, 2013) and utilised at the macro level, need to be maintained and customised so as to measure optimism at a macro level from the customers perspective.

Trust

At the micro level, it is a three dimensional variable. These are competence (ability), benevolence, and integrity (Evans & Revelle, 2008). To Dietz and Hartog (2006), trust has six dimensions' competence, benevolence, integrity, intention to act, predictability, and identification. These have been studied at both the micro and macro levels by way of modifying their associated measurement items. Therefore, trust is a multidimensional concept based on the data that has been obtained from employees and their supervisors. This study recommends the adoption and modification of those dimensions by Dietz and Hartog (2006) since they have been administered at a macro level, for customers to rate trust for the first time.

Compassion

At the micro level, it has been studied as self-compassion and at the macro level, as compassion for others. Self-compassion has been assessed using the 12-item SCS-short form (Raes *et al.*, 2011) which has three subscales and these are self-kindness, self-judgement, and common humanity. At the organisational level, there is the Compassion Scale (Pommier, 2011), which assesses compassion for others. This scale includes six subscales and these are kindness, indifference, common humanity, separation, mindfulness, and disengagement. Still at the organisational level, compassion has been studied by scholars such as Cameron *et al.*, (2004), and McLelland (2010). Muller & Whiteman (2010), who suggest that an institution's level of corporate philanthropy is a reflection of its organisational compassion. It is hereby recommended that the Compassion Scale (Pommier, 2011) be adopted for further scholarship because they already have been applied at the macro level and only need to be modified so as to reflect the point of view of customers.

Forgiveness

Forgiveness has equally been studied at both the individual and organisational level. At the individual level, self-report scales for measuring forgiveness for specific offenses exist (Rye, Loiacono, Folck, Olszewski, Heim, & Madaia, 2001; McCullough *et al.*, 1998). There is also the

Transgression-Related Interpersonal Motivations (TRIM) inventory, the Heartland Forgiveness Scale (Thompson, Snyder, Hoffman, Michael, Rasmussen, & Billings, 2005) among others. However, latest scholars such as Boonyarit, Chuawanleeb, Macaskille, and Supparerkchaisakul (2013) have proposed a workplace forgiveness scale that has four dimensions and these are overcoming negative thought and feeling toward the offender, seeking to understand the offender's reasons, fostering positive approaches towards the offender, and believing in the benefits of forgiveness. Others such as Cameron *et al.*, (2004) and Wade (1989) have equally attempted to come up with a one-dimensional scale of organisational forgiveness. The irony with these as reiterated is that they have utilised data from employees and their supervisors to the extent that they are believed to be biased (Gotsis & Grimani, 2015). This study proposes a modification of Boonyarit *et al.*'s (2013) four-dimensional scale that has already been applied at the macro level so as to elicit customers' views.

Wisdom

Prominent scholars of wisdom such as (Ardelt, 2003) argue that wisdom should be operationalised and measured as a latent variable with cognitive, reflective, and affective elements and this makes it a micro variable. She developed a three-dimensional wisdom scale (3D-WS) and these are cognitive, reflective, and affective dimensions. This scale was later administered among the elderly as a measure of wisdom at a personal level. Instead, Schmit, Muldoon, and Kate (2012) integrated management as well as psychology literature and proposed a multidimensional definition of wisdom that is applicable in a generalised organisational and managerial context. In their own view, they offer a comprehensive definition of wisdom, which has seven dimensions that include: reflective, openness, interactional aptitude, practical, ethical sensibility, paradoxical tolerance and experience (Schmit *et al.*, 2012). It is these dimensions that this study recommends to be modified since they have already been administered at the macro level and as such, could only be modified so as to facilitate the collection of views from customers.

Courage

This virtue, like any other has been studied at both the micro and macro levels. It is so far a one-dimensional construct. Norton & Weiss (2010) validated measures exist as micro measures of courage while for organisational courage, measures by Hackett and Wang, (2012), Norton and Weiss (2009), serve as common macro measures of courage respectively that only need to be adapted to this study so that customers could rate it.

Justice

This has mainly been studied at the organisational level and has been operationalised invariably by scholars. Some conceive it as a three-dimensional concept and these are distributive justice, procedural justice, and interactional justice (Folger & Konovsky, 1989). Others such as Colquitt (2001) have argued that it is a four-dimensional construct and these are distributive justice, procedural justice, interpersonal justice, and informational justice. Colquitt (2001) provides a scale that is extensive and has already been applied at the organisational level. It is this that the study recommends for modification so as to facilitate the extraction of data from customers.

Temperance

This concept has been studied at both the individual and organisational levels. At the individual level, the common Tangney, Baumeister, and Boone (2004) self-control measures are a one-dimensional scale. At a macro level, scholars have come up with two forms of self-control and these are stop-control (inhibitory control) and start-control (initiatory control) (Benjamin *et al.*, 2015). These authors claim to be the first to apply this concept to an organisational setting. By stop-control, we refer to a form of self-control behaviour in which an individual prevents an action that is likely to cause negative outcomes while start-control is a form of self-control behaviour in which an individual initiates an action that could cause positive outcomes (Benjamin *et al.*, 2015). The irony with both studies is that none of them used data from customers. For instance, Benjamin *et al.* (2015) studied two independent employee samples while that of Tangney *et al.* (2004) were undergraduate students. Nevertheless, this study recommends the two-dimensional scale by Benjamin *et al.* (2015) for modification to apply to customers since this scale has already been administered at the macro level.

Transcendence

This concept has equally been studied at both the micro and macro levels. At the micro level, self-transcendence, according to the original self-transcendence scale of the temperament and character inventory (Cloninger, Svrakic, & Przybeck, 1993) is multidimensional. The version of 240 items that was used in their study has three subscales and these are ST1, self-forgetful, totally absorbed experience versus self-conscious, self-aware or objectified experience; ST2, transpersonal identification with all of nature and its source versus self-differentiation or the self as separate; and ST3, spiritual acceptance of the transpersonal realm versus rational materialism and empirically verified phenomena

(Cloninger *et al.*, 1993). The other micro one is the Spiritual Transcendence Scale (Piedmont, 1999). This is a 24-item scale that has three subscales and these are prayer fulfillment (PF, 9 items), describing an experience of joy or contentment during prayer or meditation; universality (UN, 9 items), belief in the unity and purpose of life; connectedness (CON, 6 items), a sense of personal responsibility and connection with others. In addition is the Mysticism Scale (Hood, 1975) that consists of three factors: extrovert, introvert, and interpretation. At a macro level, organisational transcendence has been studied using the original Self-transcendence scale of the Temperament and Character Inventory (Cloninger *et al.*, 1993). The study recommends for modification the scale by (Cloninger *et al.*, 1993) that has already been organisationally tested so as to obtain the views of customers.

Commitment

Existing measures of commitment are commonly at the employee level and these translate into the conceptualisation of organisational commitment and not individual commitment. Rated by individual employees, commitment has been conceptualised as a three-dimensional construct and these are affective commitment, continuance commitment, and normative commitment (Buchanan, 1974; Quinn & Staines, 1979), although other scholars such as Mowday, Steers, and Porter (1979) look at it as a one-dimensional concept. It is those dimensions by Buchanan (1974), Quinn and Staines (1979) that could be retained and be modified to study customers because they are already organisational in nature.

Responsiveness

Even when it is a micro variable, Mei (2012) conceptualised organisational responsiveness as a seven-dimensional construct and these are threat interpretation, opportunity interpretation, resource rigidity, routine rigidity, technology uncertainty, customer uncertainty, and response uncertainty. Organisational responsiveness is also presented as a one-dimensional construct by Kohli, Bernard, and Kumar (1993) and a separate study by De Waard, Volberda, and Soeters (2013) conceived organisational responsiveness as a one-dimensional concept. This study recommends the scale by Mei (2012) that conceptualised organisational responsiveness as a seven-dimensional scale and already tested. It only requires modification so as to capture the views of customers.

Innovativeness

At a micro level, studies on innovative characteristics are scanty however, Chell and Athayde (2009) have attempted

to come up with a five-dimension model of individual innovativeness and these are creativity, leadership, energy, self-efficacy, and risk-propensity. At a macro level, this has been conceptualised as having five dimensions and these are creativity (Siegel & Kaemmerer, 1978), openness to change (Siegel & Kaemmerer, 1978), future orientation (Javidan & Waldman, 2003), risk-taking (Shoham & Rose, 2001), and proactiveness (Covin & Slevin, 1989). This model is supported by Lynch *et al.* (2010) who also suggested five factors and listed them as creativity, openness to new ideas, intention to innovate, willingness for risk-taking, and technological capacity to innovate. There is also the one-dimensional scale of Wang and Ahmed (2004) at a micro level. At a macro level, it has equally been conceptualised as innovative work behaviour by Jong and Hartog (2008) with four-dimensions and these are opportunity exploration, idea generation, championing, and implementation. This study recommends the adoption of Lynch *et al.* (2010) model for modification and subsequent application to customers because; it is already organisational in nature.

THEORETICAL IMPLICATIONS

Numerous theories have either explicitly or otherwise been put forward to explain the various virtues under consideration. Below is an examination of the theoretical debates about each virtue at both the individual and organisational levels. Each debate ends with a proposal of the likely appropriate theoretical framework that could be adopted to explain each virtue at a macro level.

Optimism

At the micro level, studies have related optimism with personality traits theory (Scheier *et al.*, 2001; Schweizer *et al.*, 2011). This theory is the basis for the study of optimism through the direct beliefs that individuals have regarding future life events other wise called the Life Orientation Test (LOT) by Scheier & Carver, (1985) and the Life Orientation Test Revised (LOT-R) by Scheier, Carver, and Bridges (1994). At a micro level still, there is the attributional theory (Weiner, 1986). This explains why people are optimistic or pessimistic and how they became this way however, the problem associated with this theory in understanding optimism is that it can be very complex and is subjectively based on self-report of past experiences (Scheier *et al.*, 2001). Virtue theory has also been handy in explaining optimism at a micro level (Cameron *et al.*, 2004) in which, being optimistic is only viewed as a personal characteristic. Schneider, (2001) believes that optimism is in some way explained by Vroom's (1964) expectancy theory of motivation. In his view, it is because a person expects to achieve a given outcome that optimistic beliefs

occur. At the macro level, the social cognitive theory emphasizes expectations (Ciarrocchi & Deneke, 2006) and has been used to explain organisational optimism. In effect, this theory argues that by paying attention to the needs of workers, management could expect increases in performance (Gabris *et al.*, 1998). To Beheshtifar (2013), organisational optimism is more consistent with Theory Y which assumes that the typical employee wants to work, enjoys meaningful responsibility, can accomplish goals, and in general, requires only minimal supervision and all that the organisation does is by improving anticipated conditions for workers (Gabris *et al.*, 1998). Still at a macro level, Fredrickson's (1998) broaden-and-build theory of positive emotions provides an explanation of how managers might create optimistic employees. According to him, positive emotions "broaden an individual's momentary range of thought-actions, which in turn builds the individual's physical, intellectual, and social resources," and as a result such employees become engaged and productive (Fredrickson, 1998: 300). It is suggested that the social exchange theory by Blau (1964), that is an encompassing theory at a macro level, be used to explain subsequent studies on organisational optimism.

Trust

At a micro level, some scholars have argued that trust is viewed as a feature of ones' personality (Colquitt, Scott, & LePine, 2007). According to Mayer *et al.* (1995: 712) trust is 'the willingness of a party to be vulnerable to the actions of another party based on the expectation that the other will respond as expected. This argument qualifies the expectancy theory of motivation by Vroom, (1964) as a framework of trust still at a micro level. At a macro level, Kramer (1999) argues that the social exchange theory can ably explain trust. This is because trusting that good behaviour will be reciprocated by management, trust is spawned in an organisational setting. In this regard, the social exchange theory explains trust at a macro level and this study recommends its adoption for further scholarship on trust at a macro level.

Compassion

At a micro level, compassion is person specific (Stamm, 2002) and this places the personality theory in compassion theoretical framework. At the macro level, are the social exchange theory with the rules of reciprocity as well as the identity theory because engaging in compassion is a form of virtuous identity (Dutton, Roberts, & Bednar, 2010). This study proposes the maintenance of the identity theory, virtue theory and social exchange in explaining compassion at the macro level.

Forgiveness

At a micro level, personality theory has been used to explain forgiveness behaviour because McCullough, Pargament, and Thoresen (2000) concluded that forgiveness is an intra-individual trait. At a macro level, the social exchange theory is equally relevant because it has been stated that forgiveness is a means to regulating workplace conflict so as to encourage meaningful cooperative behaviours (Butler & Mullis, 2001). This is because it can be used to repair broken relationships with work colleagues (Aquino *et al.*, 2003) and it results in the exchange of mutual pleasantries. Based on the foregoing remarks, it is evident that at a macro level, forgiveness could be explained by the social exchange theory. It is this that could be adopted for further scholarship on forgiveness.

Wisdom

At a micro level, wisdom is explained by implicit theories which attribute it with wise individuals (Baltes & Smith, 2008). This perspective measures the qualities of wise individuals themselves and as such makes wisdom a personality characteristic instead of it being context specific (Ardelt, 2003; Webster, 2003). It is of no wonder that it describes wisdom in terms of personality characteristics such as cognitive, affective, and reflective (Ardelt, 2003), and that wise people are knowledgeable, mature, and tolerant among others (Baltes & Smith, 2008). The second perspective of research on wisdom places it within explicit theories that present wisdom as formulations of experts and researchers and not ordinary people (Sternberg, 1990). This body of theories places wisdom within institutions and not individuals and it is from here that individuals derive it so as to act wisely. This means that at a macro level, the institutional theory (Scott, 2004) could be of value in explaining wisdom. It is this theory that could be adopted for further scholarship on wisdom at a macro level.

Courage

At a micro level, virtue theory is explicit. For instance, moral courage is associated with the need to stand up to a just call (Walker & Firmer, 2007). This places courage in the field of virtue theory. Moral courage is equally associated with social control. Social control involves an intervention that limits bad behaviour. This means that courage could be advanced at a micro level by the social action theory (Becker, 1971). This theory assumes that people have a much more proactive role in shaping social life and this is why most people act voluntarily because they are free to do so. At a macro level, although social action theorists argue that people operate as individuals, they argue that people are aware of other people around them and the attitudes and actions of other people

influence the way others think and behave. In this regard, they are bound to act because of influence. This reasoning is alluded to by virtue theory which argues that virtuous people make others copy virtue behaviours. This makes the social action theory retain a macro element although; virtue theory takes precedent in explaining courage in this context. As a result, at a macro level, the social action theory and virtue theory are recommended to be retained for further scholarship on the concept.

Justice

As indicated earlier, this concept has been heavily studied at the macro level. There is indeed sparse literature on the micro orientation of this variable. At the macro level, Masterson, Lewis, Goldman, and Taylor (2000) used the social exchange theory to argue that interactional justice affects leader-member exchange perceptions because people draw on interactional justice perceptions when deciding on how to react to their supervisors as agents of decision-making authority. Relatedly, Moye, Masterson, and Bartol (1997) argue that procedural justice had a greater effect on a system variable such as trust in management and this introduces the systems theory in the model of organisational justice. Therefore, at a macro level, the social exchange and systems theory could be of sound relevance in explaining the concept of justice since they are broad in their explanatory capacity.

Temperance

At a macro level, temperance is the result of virtuous people influencing others to be virtuous. The more general concept of personal control has been important in the work and organisational psychology literature where the Job Demands-Resources Model (JD-R) talk of control (Bakker & Demerouti, 2007). Research has provided evidence for the existence of two simultaneous processes. High job demands exhaust employees' mental and physical resources and therefore lead to the depletion of energy and to health problems. This is what is retained in the health impairment process. In contrast, job resources expected by employees, foster employee engagement and extra-role performance and this is the motivational process. In this regard, the motivational control implores employees to ensure self-control in face of high job demands. It is a virtue to be with self-control. As such, virtue theory could explain transcendence at a macro level.

Transcendence

At a micro level, piedmont (1999) argues that self-transcendence is an intrinsic motivational issue because;

an individual possesses innate drives which make him or her select behaviours on the basis of innate personal interpretations about life. Self-transcendence implies that a person realises that he is individualistic and not immortal and decides on his or her own to glorify God and care for others. In this way, individuals become inherently able to act humanely towards others (Piedmont, 2001). This explains why Piedmont developed the Spiritual Transcendence Scale, by reviewing religious texts and consulting theological experts from different spiritual backgrounds and as such, theoretically, self-transcendence is a motivational issue as well as an ethical one. Cloninger *et al.* (1993) view self-transcendence within a personality framework. Therefore, at a micro level, self-transcendence can be explained by motivation, virtue and personality theoretical frameworks. At a macro level, scholars have associated transcendence with the identity theory. For instance, Cloninger *et al.* (1993) described self-transcendence as an experience of identification with a personal feeling of being an integral part of all of nature. This is because self-transcendence involves the loss of a sense of self and as such the identification which a totality that is treasured. It is argued that a sense of one's individual self is lost to the extent that no distinction exists between the self and others (Cloninger *et al.*, 1993). Therefore, the identity theory (Mead, 1934), is here by recommended for adoption as a theoretical framework for the explanation of transcendence at a macro level.

Commitment

At a micro level, commitment is associated with the self-determination theory of motivation (SDT) by (Deci and Ryan, 1985; Ryan and Deci, 2000). The SDT identifies three psychological needs: autonomy (deCharms, 1968), competence (White, 1959), and relatedness (Beaumeister & Leary, 1995). These needs are the basic ingredients required for psychological health and as such the commitment of an employee and it is the satisfaction of these needs rather than their strength that determines well-being and employee commitment (Ryan & Deci, 2000). However, at a macro level, identity theory (Mead, 1934) has been considered. Indeed Porter, Steers, Mowday, and Bouhan (1974), argue that organisational commitment embraces the ideals of identification, involvement and loyalty to an organisation. This is because it is a form of identification with the values and goals of the organisation and an employee becomes willing to put in extra effort on its behalf. Organisational commitment is also explained by the "side-bet" theory (Becker, 1960; Alutto, Hrebimak, & Alonso, 1973). This theory holds that individuals are committed to the organisation as long as they hold their positions, irrespective of the stressful conditions they undergo. However, should this not happen, they are always willing to leave the organisation. Mowday, Porter, and Steers (1982) support the "side-bet" theory by indicating

that organisational commitment is behaviour in which individuals are tied to a particular organisation and how they respond to this condition. Therefore, identity theory explains organisational commitment and could be utilised for further scholarship on the same concept.

Responsiveness

At a micro level, to be responsive is character strength and as such an individual virtue explained by the virtue theory. At a macro level, the threat rigidity theory (Staw, Sandelands, & Dutton, 1981) is handy. This theory argues that successful threat interpretation increases organisational laziness because it forces it to reduce alternatives and concentrate on previous activities (Staw *et al.*, 1981) in response. The prospect theory (Kahneman & Tversky 1979) argues that opportunity perception leads to the detection of noticeable potential gains rather than the risks involved (March & Shapira, 1987) and so is the responsiveness associated. Accordingly, Chattopadhyay, Glick, and Huber (2001) have argued that in an ambiguous situation, threat rigidity theory is strong in predicting threat response while prospect theory works well for opportunity response. The organisational learning theory is equally important in the explanation of organisational responsiveness. This is why Ketchen & Hult (2007:284) claimed that "responsiveness is dependent on the ability of an organisation to learn about changes in its market environment". This theory is recommended for adoption in explaining organisational responsiveness.

Innovativeness

Individual innovation is a set of personality characteristics as outputs, and behaviours. Scholars such as Hurt, Joseph, and Cook (1977) consider it as generalised willingness to change and this makes it an individual personality view of innovation. At a macro level, innovativeness of an individual is equally explained by Bandura's social learning theory which posits that with the right support and environment, nearly all people have the potential to strengthen and develop their skills. Others such as Scott & Bruce (1994), conceptualise individual innovation as discretionary employee behaviours and this makes innovation to be explained by organisational behaviour theory. West (1987) proposes an output approach to innovative behaviour because his measure of role innovation makes it clear how many changes an individual has initiated in his or her job in relation to the last role occupant. In the same way, Axtell, Holman, Unsworth, Wall, Waterson, and Harrington (2000) measure assess individuals' self-ratings of their suggestions and realised innovations. These approaches locate innovation in the performance management theoretical framework. Therefore, at a micro level, innovativeness is explained by

personality theory and social learning theory while at the macro level, organisational behaviour and performance management theories become handy. Therefore, a prominent theoretical framework of organisational behaviour is social exchange that could be adopted for further scholarship on innovativeness.

METHODOLOGICAL IMPLICATIONS

The most common methodological orientations of studies on each virtue are examined. This is in terms of their philosophical perspective i.e. whether they followed an objective or subjective view of reality, their designs i.e. whether they were qualitative or quantitative, longitudinal or cross sectional in nature. We further highlight the measurement scales of each virtue at both the micro and macro levels where appropriate besides an indication of the whether these previous studies have been empirical or theoretical in nature. We conclude each virtue by providing possible methodological breakthroughs that future studies on the virtues considered could adopt.

Optimism

Some studies have examined optimism quantitatively and longitudinally. For instance, the one year study of optimism using the one-dimensional scale Life Orientation Test (LOT) by Scheier and Carver (1985) and later the Life Orientation Test Revised (LOT-R) by Scheier *et al.* (1994) which has 10 (ten) items and the LOT-R is currently viewed as the most popular measure of optimism. The philosophical orientation was objective and the design was mixed i.e. quantitative and longitudinal. In these studies, sample measurement items included “In uncertain times, I usually expect the best” and the reverse-coded item “If something can go wrong for me, it will.” These were anchored on 5 point likert scale that ranged from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree). Although some studies have maintained the LOT-R, items have been anchored on a four-point scale (Schweizer *et al.*, 2011). There has also been the application of Attributional Style Questionnaire (ASQ) to measure optimistic individual behaviour based on the attribution theory. Using this questionnaire, individuals have responded to what they believe are the causes to different life scenarios. The study by Beheshtifar (2013) on organisational optimism is purely a theoretical review and only concludes by way of a recommendation that optimism can be developed by managers through training and effectively managed so as to enhance performance in the workplace. We propose that in order to measure the perceptions of organisational optimism by customers, a more objective philosophical orientation be adopted in which a mixed design should be employed. Furthermore, the existing measures of optimism by Cameron

et al. (2004) and the LOT-R 10 (ten) items by Scheier *et al.* (1994) be adopted and modified because they have stood the test of time. This could be done as follows: As a customer of this organisation, am optimistic that I will succeed, even when faced with major challenges”; “As a customer of this organisation, the employees of this hotel are dedicated to doing good in addition to doing well”. Items should similarly be anchored on a 5-point Likert measurement scale ranging from “strongly disagree” (1) to “strongly agree” (5).

Trust

Trust has been studied quantitatively mainly using a questionnaire. For instance, in a particular study by Dietz and Hartog (2006), fourteen (14) dimensions of trust with their measurement items were compiled in a theoretical paper. The weakness with this paper is that it is purely a theoretical paper, in which trust measures have been laid bare by the scholars. More effort is needed to empirically test the proposed dimensions and items. Nevertheless, Dietz and Hartog (2006) only emphasize that an objective philosophical orientation has been dominant, with a quantitative design facilitated by a questionnaire as a data collection method.

The factors of trust that have been proposed (Strickland, 1958; Butler, 1991) are ability (competence), benevolence, and integrity. The sample questions are as follows “Most managers are honest and truthful about information to do with the job”, “Management are sincere in their attempts to meet the workers’ point of view about the job”, and “Management is competent when it comes to matters of safety on the job”. We propose that in order to measure the perceptions of organisational trust, the existing measures of organisational trust by Clark and Payne (1997) and Mayer and Davis (1999) be adopted and modified as follows: “As a customer, most managers in this organisation are honest and truthful about information to do with the job”, “As a customer, I consider management to be sincere in their attempts to meet the workers’ point of view about the job”. The items should similarly be anchored on a 5-point Likert measurement scale ranging from “strongly disagree” (1) to “strongly agree” (5). We further recommend that future studies on trust be mainly mixed in terms philosophical orientation, designs and methods. This has the advantage of obtaining more compound findings on the virtue.

Compassion

This has equally been studied following an objective philosophical orientation and quantitatively. The recently created Compassion Scale (Pommier, 2011), which assesses compassion for others along similar dimensions as self-

compassion has been applied. This scale has six subscales: kindness (e.g., “If I see someone going through a difficult time, I try to be caring toward that person.”); indifference (reverse-coded; e.g., “I don’t concern myself with other people’s problems.”); common humanity (e.g., “Suffering is just a part of the common human experience”); separation (reverse-coded; e.g., “When I see someone feeling down, I feel like I can’t relate to them”); mindfulness (e.g., “I notice when people are upset, even if they don’t say anything”); and disengagement (reverse-coded; e.g., “I often tune out when people tell me about their troubles.”). At the macro level, Cameron *et al.*’s (2004) sample items are “Acts of compassion are common here in this organisation”, “This organisation is characterised by many acts of concern and caring for other people”, and “Many stories of compassion and concern circulate among the members on this organisation”. For the benefit of future scholarship, it is here by suggested that future studies on compassion could adopt the Compassion Scale (Pommier, 2011) and should be mainly mixed in terms philosophical orientation, designs and methods. This has the advantage of obtaining a more compound set of findings on the compassion. Indeed, the very measures could be modified to measure the customers view as follows: “As a customer, acts of compassion are common here in this organisation”, “As a customer, this organisation is characterised by many acts of concern and caring for other people”, A 5-point Likert measurement scale ranging from “strongly disagree” (1) to “strongly agree” (5) could be adopted.

Forgiveness

The most popular micro level measurement scale of forgiveness is the self-report measure of situational, interpersonal forgiveness (McCullough *et al.*, 2000). Nevertheless, using largely a quantitative approach, scholars such as Cameron *et al.* (2004), Wade (1989), Boonyarit *et al.* (2013), and McCullough *et al.* (1998) have examined organisational forgiveness as a concept. The philosophical orientation has been objective and a quantitative design. At a macro level, the study recommends the adoption of the scale by McCullough *et al.*, (1998). This is because it is already organisational in nature and has been tested and found valid. The modifications could be as follows: “As a customer, I feel that employees of this organisation make one another to pay after wronging each other”, “As a customer, I feel that employees keep as much distance between themselves as possible”. It is further proposed that future studies on forgiveness be mainly mixed in terms philosophical orientation, designs and methods so as to obtain a more compound set of findings on forgiveness. Relatedly, the items should be anchored on a 5-point Likert measurement scale ranging from “strongly disagree” (1) to “strongly agree” (5).

Wisdom

At a micro level, the Self Assessed Wisdom Scale (SAWS) measures five components of wisdom: openness, emotional regulation, humor, critical life experience, and reminiscence and reflectiveness (Webster, 2007; Taylor, Bates, & Webster, 2011). It consists of 40 items presented with a 5-point Likert scale that ranges from “strongly disagree” to “strongly agree”. At a micro level still, the three-dimensional wisdom scale (3DWS) (Ardelt, 2011) looks at wisdom as being constituted by cognitive (14 items), reflective (12 items), and affective dimensions (13 items). 24 of its items are presented with a 5-point response scale that ranges from “definitely true of myself” to “not true of myself,” and 15 are presented with a 5-point Likert scale from “strongly agree” to “strongly disagree.” At the macro level, the prominent seven-dimensional scales by Schmit *et al.*, (2012), has items used to measure each of the proposed dimensions of wisdom using a five-point likert-type scale that has been labeled “strongly disagree” and “strongly agree. Its philosophical orientation was objective and quantitative design. It is however, recommended that future studies on wisdom be mainly mixed in terms philosophical orientation, designs and methods.

Courage

Regardless of the level at which courage has been studied, the philosophical orientation has been predominantly objective, the design has been quantitative and it is of no wonder that questionnaires have been adopted to collect data. For instance, Schmidt and Koselka’s (2000) Courage Scale and the scale associated with Woodard (2004) which has 31 items that created four separate factors. One of the items is “I would return into a burning building to save a family pet I loved dearly.” There is the Norton and Weiss’s (2009) courage scale. Sample measurement items are “My supervisor acts with sustained initiative, even in the face of incurring personal risk”, “I tend to face my fears”, “If the thought of something makes me anxious, I usually will avoid it”. The challenge with the above scales is that they are micro in nature. However, the Hackett and Wang (2012), Norton and Weiss (2009; 2010) scales have at least been extrapolated and applied at a macro level. We recommend that future studies on courage be mainly mixed in terms philosophical orientation, designs and methods. The review proposes the integration of measures by Hackett and Wang, (2012), Norton and Weiss (2009; 2010) because they fit within the scope of this study. The above sample items would be modified to appear as follows: as a customer, a supervisor in this organisation acts with sustained initiative, even in the face of incurring personal risk. “As a customer, I

tend to face my fears when dealing with this organisation". The items should similarly be anchored on a 5-point Likert measurement scale ranging from "strongly disagree" (1) to "strongly agree" (5).

Justice

This has been studied mainly at a macro level. In a study by Colquitt (2001) items that measure each dimension of organisational justice were derived from a review of the seminal works in the justice literature. The items were anchored on a 5-point scale ranging from 1 = to a small extent and 5 = to a large extent. There is also the Moorman (1991) organisational justice scale where procedural and relational justices are measured by seven and six items respectively as suggested by Elovainio, Kivimäki, and Vahtera (2002). 156 questionnaires were distributed to the selected employees whom the study does not indicate how they were arrived at besides the lack of an indication of the overall design that the study adopted. Still at a macro level, there is Neihoff and Moorman (1993) scale that has three subscales and these are distributive justice perceptions measured with a 5-item scale, procedural justice perceptions measured with a 6-item scale, and the interactional justice perceptions measured with 11-item scale. The review recommends Neihoff and Moorman (1993) scale for adoption since it has been found to be valid and reliable in measuring justice perceptions at a macro level (Moorman *et al.*, 1998) and, although an objective philosophical orientation and a quantitative design have been dominant, future studies on justice be mainly mixed in terms philosophical orientation, designs and methods.

Temperance

The study of temperance at both the micro and macro levels has utilised the same measurement scales and associated items. For instance, the measures of self-control by Benjamin *et al.*, (2015) in which 231 employees were asked to fill a self-control measure by De Boer *et al.*, (2011), which consisted of two dimensions stop-control (nine items) and start-control (eight items). The items were those as developed in the SCS (Tangney *et al.*, 2004), the self-control schedule (Rosenbaum, 1980), and the ego-under control scale (Letzring *et al.*, 2005). Sample items include "I can easily stop doing something fun that I know to be bad for me" (stop-control) and "Even if I don't feel like it, I'm able to complete the tasks that needed to be done" (start-control). The philosophical orientation has mainly been objective and a quantitative design. The recommendation is that future studies on self-control be mainly mixed in terms philosophical orientation, designs and methods.

Transcendence

At both the micro and macro levels, different scales of transcendence have been applied. For instance, at the micro level, there is the original self-transcendence scale of the Temperament and Character Inventory (Cloninger *et al.*, 1993) with three sub scales and these are ST1: (11 items), ST2: (9 items), and ST3: (13 items). Then the Spiritual Transcendence Scale (STS) by Piedmont (1999) is a 24-item scale with three subscales: prayer fulfillment (PF, 9 items), universality (UN, 9 items), and connectedness (CON, 6 items). Items are rated on a Likert-type scale of 1- strongly disagree to 5- strongly agree, the Mysticism Scale (Hood, 1975) and the Self Transcendence Scale (STS) by Reed, (1991) which measures self-transcendence using 15 self-report. For example, the STS asks participants to rate on a 4-point Likert scale their current levels of "accepting death as a part of life," and "helping others in some way" (Reed, 1991:6). At the macro level transcendence has been studied differently for instance amongst leaders as transcendent leadership. The scale used was the Centre for Creative Leadership executive dimension's instrument (CCL, 2002). All these previous endeavours point to the understanding that the philosophical orientation has been objective and a quantitative design. The review recommends that future studies on transcendence be mainly mixed in terms philosophical orientation, designs and methods.

Commitment

This virtue has largely been studied at the macro level. For instance, the Meyer and Allen (1984) study had 64 male and female introductory psychology volunteer students as respondents. In this study, Ritzer-Trice and Hrebiniak-Alutto Scales, both the 15-item by Ritzer and Trice (1969) and the 4-item by Hrebiniak and Alutto (1972) were combined to form the questionnaire against a 3-point response format and these were labeled as definitely would (1), uncertain (2), and definitely would not (3). The instruments used were The Organisational Commitment Questionnaire (Porter *et al.*, 1974; Mowday *et al.*, 1979) with 15-item measure that assessed the affective orientation to the organisation and this questionnaire used a 7-point Likert-type response format (strongly disagree to strongly agree). The Affective Commitment Scale is an 8-item measure developed by the authors and it uses a 7-point Likert-type response format (strongly disagree to strongly agree). It includes items such as. "This organisation has a great deal of personal meaning for me" and "I do not feel 'emotionally attached' to this organisation" (reversed). The Continuance Commitment Scale is an 8-item measure, assesses the extent to which employees feel committed to their organisations by virtue of the costs that they feel are associated with leaving. The

scale uses a 7-point response format (strongly disagree to strongly agree). Sample items in this scale include “It would be very hard for me to leave my organisation right now, even if I wanted to” and “It would not be too costly for me to leave my organisation in the near future” (reversed). In all, an objective orientation and a quantitative design have been applied before. Therefore, the review recommends that future studies on commitment be mainly mixed in nature so that philosophically, it is both objective and subjective as well as the designs and methods.

Responsiveness

In a study by Mei (2012), organisational responsiveness was conceived as a seven-dimensional construct and these are threat interpretation, opportunity interpretation, resource rigidity, routine rigidity, technology uncertainty, customer uncertainty, and response uncertainty. To measure threat and opportunity interpretation, measures by White, Varadarajan, and Dacin (2003), Dutton and Jackson (1987) were considered. For resource rigidity, measures by Chandy *et al.* (1998) and for routine rigidity, measures by Douglas and Judge (2001) are applied. Regarding technology uncertainty, customer uncertainty measures by Jaworski and Kohli (1993) and response uncertainty measures by Milliken (1990) were applied. The alternative measures of organisational responsiveness are those that were developed by Kohli *et al.* (1993). Examples of items used for measuring responsiveness include speed and coordination with which the actions (marketing programs) were implemented, periodically reviewing product/service development, evaluation of over- or under filling of goals and correcting accordingly, and interdepartmental cooperation and coordination. In a separate study (De Waard *et al.*, 2013) organisational responsiveness was conceived a one-dimensional concept. The study's was a large sample survey and a questionnaire was distributed to a large group of military officers that were obtained from the Netherlands armed forces. In all, an objective orientation of the studies is observed as well as the quantitative design. Therefore, we recommend that future studies on responsiveness be mainly mixed in nature so that philosophically, it is both objective and subjective as well as the designs and methods.

Innovativeness

The fact that it has been conceptualised by different scholars, numerous measures exist for the varying dimensions of innovativeness and these are creativity and its five items (Siegel & Kaemmerer, 1978), openness to change and the four items (Siegel & Kaemmerer, 1978), future orientation and the four items (Javidan & Waldman, 2003), risk-

taking and the four items (Shoham & Rose, 2001), and proactiveness and the four items (Covin & Slevin, 1989). There are those by Lynch *et al.* (2010) and their associated measures. The dimensions are creativity, openness to new ideas, intention to innovate, willingness for risk-taking, and technological capacity to innovate. Wang and Ahmed (2004) also provide their one-dimensional scale of organisational innovativeness. At a macro level, we have the measures of innovative work behaviour by Jong and Hartog (2008) which represent a four-dimensional scale of organisational innovativeness and these are opportunity exploration, idea generation, championing, and implementation. At a micro level, individual innovative characteristics have been measured by Chell and Athayde (2009) under their proposed five-dimension model and these are creativity, leadership, energy, self-efficacy, and risk-propensity. In all, we observe an objective orientation of the studies before as well as the quantitative design. Therefore, we recommend that future studies on innovativeness should be mixed in nature so that philosophically, it is both objective and subjective as well as the designs and methods. This will go a long way in facilitating the generation of a more comprehensive report on innovativeness.

Directions for future research

As examined in the foregoing debates, this paper is a theoretical one. An empirical paper is needed to come up with a revised factor structure of the concept organisational virtuousness. We propose a triangulation of both the designs and methods. Most specifically, we recommend explicitly that future studies should bring out more dependable mixed designs of both qualitative and quantitative orientations and a questionnaire and oral interviews are more convenient and appropriate. This time, customers need to be consulted in an effort to elicit the rating of the extent of organisational virtuousness of their related organisations since they have been ignored completely in earlier efforts (Gotsis & Grmani, 2015). There is no harm in subjecting the proposed factor structure to the views of employees and supervisors since the paper proposes new virtues that have been associated with organisations but have not been considered in the earlier operational definition of organisational virtuousness. With all the above considered systematically, we believe, shall in effect be additions to existing knowledge.

REFERENCES

- Acclivus R3 Solutions and Training Industry, Inc. (2014). All rights reserved.
- Alsalem M., & Alhaiani, A. (2007). Relationship between organizational justice and employees' performance. *Aledari*, 108, 97-110.

- Alutto, J. A., Hrebimak, L. G., & Alonso, R. C. (1973). On operationalizing the concept of commitment. *Social Forces*, 51, 448-45.
- Amue, G. J., & Adiele, K. C. (2012). New product development and consumer innovative behaviour: An empirical validation study. *European Journal of Business and Social Sciences*, 1(6), 97-109. Retrieved from <http://www.Ejbss.Com/Recent.Asp?Issn: 2235 -767x>
- Aquino, K., Grover, S. L., Goldman, B., & Folger, R. (2003). When push doesn't come to shove: Interpersonal forgiveness in workplace relationships. *Journal of Management Inquiry*, 12(3), 3209-216. doi:10.1177/1056492603256337
- Ardelt, M. (2003). Empirical assessment of a three-dimensional wisdom scale. *Research on Aging*, 25(3), 275-324. DOI: 10.1177/0164027503251764
- Ardelt, M. (2011). The measurement of wisdom: A commentary on Taylor, Bates, and Webster's comparison of the SAWS and 3D-WS. *Exp. Aging Res.* 37, 241-255. doi: 10.1080/0361073X.2011.554509
- Arjoon, S. (2010). Aristotelian-Thomistic virtue ethics: Emotional intelligence and decision-making. *Advances in Management*, 3(4), 7-13.
- Axtell, C. M., Holman, D. J., Unsworth, K. L., Wall, T. D., Waterson, P. E., & Harrington, E. (2000). Shop floor innovation: Facilitating the suggestion and implementation of ideas. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 73, 265-285.
- Bagozzi, R. P., Frank, B., & Willem, V. (2010). The Role of emotional wisdom in salespersons' relationships with colleagues and customers. *Psychology & Marketing*, 27(11), 1001-1031. Wiley Periodicals, Inc. DOI: 10.1002/mar.20370
- Bakker, A. B., & Demerouti, E. (2007). The job demands-resources model: State of the art. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 22, 309-328.
- Baltes, P. B., & Smith, J. (2008). The fascination of wisdom: Its nature, ontogeny, and function. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 3(1), 56-64.
- Balliet, T., & Kelloway, E. K. (2011). Virtuous leaders: Assessing character strengths in the workplace. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences*, 28, 270-283.
- Beaumeister, R., & Leary, M. R. (1995). The need to belong: Desire for interpersonal attachments as a fundamental human motivation. *Psychological Bulletin*, 117, 497-529.
- Beheshtifar, M. (2013). Organizational optimism: A Considerable issue to success. *Journal of Social Issues & Humanities*, 1(6). ISSN 2345-2633 69.
- Becker, G. S. (1971). *The economics of discrimination*. Chicago, University of Chicago Press.
- Becker, H. S. (1960). Notes on the concept of commitment. *American Journal of Sociology*, 66, 32-42.
- Boer, B. J. D., Hooft, E. A. J. V., & Bakker, A. B. (2015). Self-control at work: Its relationship with contextual performance. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 30(4), 406-421.
- Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and Power in social life*. New York: John Wiley.
- Boonyarit, I., Chuawanleeb, W., Macaskill, A., & Supparerkchaisakul, N. (2013). A psychometric analysis of the workplace forgiveness scale. *Europe's Journal of Psychology*, 9(2), 319-338. doi:10.5964/ejop.v9i2.551.
- Brockner, J. (2010). *A contemporary look at organizational justice: Multiplying insult times injury*. New York: Routledge.
- Buchanan, B. (1974). Building organizational commitment: The socialization of managers in work organizations. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 19, 533-546.
- Butler, J. K. (1991). Toward understanding and measuring conditions of trust: Evolution of a condition of trust inventory. *Journal of Management*, 17, 643-663.
- Butler, D. S., & Mullis, F. (2001). Forgiveness: A conflict resolution strategy in the workplace. *Journal of Individual Psychology*, 57(3), 259-272.
- Cameron, K. S., Bright, D., & Caza, A. (2004). Exploring the relationships between OV and performance. *American Behavioral Scientist* 47(6), 766-790.
- Carver, C. S., Scheier, M. F., & Segerstrom, S. C. (2010). *Optimism, Clinical Psychology Review*, 30(7), 879-889.
- Cavanagh, G. F., & Moberg, D. J. (1999). The virtue of courage within the organization. In M. L. Pava & P. Primeaux (Eds.), *Research in ethical issues in organizations* (Vol. 1, pp. 1-25). Stamford, CT: JAI Press.
- Caza, A., Barker, B. A., & Cameron, K. (2004). Ethics and ethos: the buffering and amplifying effects of ethical behavior and virtuousness. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 52, 169-78.
- Chattopadhyay, P., Glick, W. H., & Huber, G. P. (2001). Organizational actions in response to threats and opportunities. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 44(5), 937-55.
- Chell, E., & Athayde, R. (2009). The identification and measurement of innovative characteristics of young people: Development of the Youth Innovation Skills Measurement Tool, NESTA.
- Ciarrocchi, J. W., & Deneke, E. (2006). Hope, optimism, pessimism, and spirituality as predictors of well-being controlling for personality. *Research in the Social Scientific Study of Religion*, 16, 162-174.
- Clark, M. C., & Payne, R. L. (1997). The nature and structure of workers' trust in Management. *Journal of Organisational Behavior*, 18, 205-24.

- Cloninger, C. R., Svrakic, D. M., & Przybeck, T. R. (1993). A psychobiological model of temperament and character. *Arch Gen Psychiatry*, 50, 975-990.
- Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the dimensionality of organizational justice: A construct validation of a measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86, 386-400.
- Colquitt, J. A., Scott, B. A., & LePine, J. A. (2007). Trust, trustworthiness, and trust propensity: A meta-analytic test of their unique relationships with risk taking and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(4), 909-927.
- Covin, J. G., & Slevin, D. P. (1989). Strategic management of small firms in hostile and benign environments. *Strategic Management Journal*, 10, 75-87.
- Covin, J. G., & Slevin, D. P. (1989). Strategic management of small firms in hostile and benign environments. *Strategic Management Journal*, 10, 75-87.
- Crockett, C. (2005). The cultural paradigm of virtue. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 62, 191-208.
- De Boer, B. J., Van Hooft, E. A. J., & Bakker, A. B. (2011). Stop and start-control: A distinction within self-control. *European Journal of Personality*, 55(5), 349-362.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York: Plenum Publishing Co.
- De Matos, C. A., Henrique, J. L., & de Rosa, F. (2013). Customer reactions to service failure and recovery in the banking industry: The influence of switching costs. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 27(7), 526-538.
- De Waard, E., Volberda, H. W., & Soeters, J. (2013). Drivers of organizational responsiveness, experiences of a military crisis response organization. *Journal of Organization Design, JOD*, 2(2), 1-14. DOI: 10.7146/jod.7850.
- Dietz, G., & Hartog, D. N. D. (2006). Measuring trust inside organizations. *Personnel Review*, 35(5), 557-588.
- Dutton, J. E., Roberts, L. M., & Bednar, J. (2010). Pathways to positive identity construction at work: Four types of positive identity and the building of social resources. *Academy of Management Review*, 35(2), 265-293.
- Elovainio, M., Kivimäki, M., & Vahtera, J. (2002). Organizational justice: Evidence of a new psychosocial predictor of health. *American Journal of Public Health*, 92, 105-108. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.92.1.105>
- Evans, A. M., & Revelle, W. (2008). Survey and behavioral measurements of interpersonal trust. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 42(2008), 1585-1593.
- Exline, J. J., Worthington, E. L., Jr., Hill, P., & McCullough, M. E. (2003). Forgiveness and justice: A research agenda for social and personality psychology. *Personality and Social Psychology Review*, 7(4), 337-348.
- Fatt, C. K., Wong, K. E., & Heng, T. N. (2010). The impact of organizational justice on employees' job satisfaction: The Malaysian companies perspectives. *American Journal of Economics and Business Administration*, 2(1), 56-63.
- Fodor, M., & Messerli, H. (2012). *Uganda tourism sector situational assessment: Tourism reawakening*. Technical document of the World Bank.
- Folger, R., & Konovsky, M. A. (1989). Effects of procedural and distributive justice on reactions to pay raise decisions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 32, 115-130.
- Fredrickson, B. L. (1998). What Good are Positive Emotions? *Review of General Psychology*, 2, 300-319.
- Frost, T., Simpson, D. V., & Mahugan, M. R. C. (1978). Some correlates of trust. *Journal of Psychology*, 99, 103-108.
- Gabris, G. T., Maclin, S. A., & Ihrke, D. M. (1998). The leadership enigma: Toward a model of organizational optimism. *Journal of Management History*, 4(4), 396-399.
- Gautschi, T. (2002) *Trust and exchange: Effects of temporal embeddedness and network embeddedness on providing a surplus*. Amsterdam: Thela Thesis.
- Goetz J. L., Keltner, D., & Simon-Thomas, E. (2010). Compassion: An evolutionary analysis and empirical review. *Psychological Review*, 136, 351-374.
- Gotsis, G., & Grimani, K. (2015). Virtue theory and organizational behavior: An integrative framework. *Journal of Management Development*, 34(10), 1288-1309.
- Hackett, R. D., & Wang, Q. (2012). Virtues and leadership: An integrating conceptual framework founded in Aristotelian and Confucian perspectives on virtues. *Management Decision*, 50(5), 868-899.
- Halliburton, C., & Poenaru, A. (2010). *The role of trust in consumer relationships*. ESCP Europe Business School.
- Haws, K. L., Bearden, W. O., & Nenkov, G. Y. (2011). Consumer spending self-control effectiveness and outcome elaboration prompts. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science*.
- Hood, R. W., Jr. (1975). The construction and preliminary validation of a measure of reported mystical experience. *Journal for the Scientific Study of Religion*, 14, 29-41.
- Hult, G. T. M., David, J. K., & Stanley, F. S. (2005). Market orientation and performance: An integration of disparate approaches. *Strategic Management Journal*, 26(12), 1173-81.
- Hurt, H., Joseph, K., & Cook, C. (1977). Scale for the measurement of innovativeness. *Human Communication Research*, 4, 58-65.
- Jarzabkowski, P., Lê, J., & Van De Ven, A., (2013), Responding to competing strategic demands: How organizing, belonging, and performing paradoxes coevolve. *Strategic Organization*, 1-36.

- Javidan, M., & Waldman, D. A., (2003). Exploring charismatic leadership in the public sector: measurement and consequences. *Public Administration Review*, 63(2), 229-242.
- Jaworski, B. J., & Kohli, A. K., (1993). Market orientation: antecedents and consequences. *Journal of Marketing* 57(3), 53-70.
- Joireman, J., Yany, G., & Tripp, T. M. (2016) Customer forgiveness following service failures, *Current Opinion in Psychology*, 10:76–82, www.sciencedirect.com, <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.copsyc.2015.11.005>
- Jong, J. P. J. de., & Hartog, D. N. D. (2008) Innovative Work Behavior: Measurement and Validation; SCALES-initiative (SCientific AnaLysis of Entrepreneurship and SMEs), as part of the 'SMEs and Entrepreneurship programme' financed by the Netherlands Ministry of Economic Affairs.
- Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (1979) Prospect Theory: An Analysis of Decision Under Risk. *Econometrica*, 47(2), 263-92.
- Ketchen Jr, D. J., & Hult, G. T. M. (2007). Bridging organization theory and supply chain management: the case of best value supply chains. *Journal of Operations Management*, 25(2), 573-580.
- Kohli, A., Bernard, J., & Kumar, A. (1993). MARKOR: A measure of market orientation. *Journal of Marketing Research*, 30 (November), p. 467-77.
- Kramer, R. M. (1999). Trust and distrust in organizations: Emerging perspectives, enduring questions. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 50(1), 569-598.
- Law, M. (2014). To forgive or not to forgive: Relationships among Justice, revenge, avoidance, benevolence and citizenship behavior. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 5(12).
- Lynch, D., Laws, K. R., & McKenna, P. J. (2010). Cognitive behavioural therapy for major psychiatric disorder: does it really work? A meta-analytical review of well-controlled trials. *Psychol Med.*, 40(1), 9-24. doi: 10.1017/S003329170900590X
- Lynette, D. (2009). Are you a trusted leader? *Industrial and Commercial Training*, 41(7), 377-381.
- Malik, M. E., Samina, N., Basharat, N., & Rizwan, Q. D. (2010). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment of university teachers in public sector of Pakistan. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 5(6).
- Mann, R. (2014). *Assessing the Optimism of Payday Loan Borrowers*, University of Chicago.
- March, J. G., & Zur, S. (1987). Managerial perspectives on risk and risk taking. *Management Science*, 33(11), 1404-1418.
- Masterson, S. S., Lewis, K., Goldman, B. M., & Taylor, M. S. (2000). Integrating justice and social exchange: The differing effects of fair procedures and treatment on work relationships. *Academy of Management Journal*, 43, 738-748.
- Mayer, R. C., & Davis, J. H. (1999). The effect of the performance appraisal system on trust for management: A field quasi-experiment. *Journal of Applied psychology*, 84(1), 123.
- Mayer, R. C., Davis, J. H., & Schoorman, F. D. (1995). *The Academy of Management Review*, 20(3), 709-734.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1987). Organizational commitment: Toward a three-component model. Research Bulletin No. 660. The University of Western Ontario, Department of Psychology, London.
- McLelland, L. (2010). From compassion to client satisfaction: Examining the relationship between routines that facilitate compassion and quality of service. Working Paper, Emory University.
- McCullough, M. E., Rachal, K. C., Sandage, S. J., Worthington, E. L., Brown, S. W., & Hight, T. L. (1998). Interpersonal forgiving in close relationships. II: Theoretical elaboration and measurement. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 75, 1586-1603.
- McCullough, M. E., Pargament, K. I., & Thoresen, C. E. (2000). The psychology of forgiveness: History, conceptual Issues, and overview. In M. E. McCullough, K. I. Pargament, & C. E. Thoresen (Eds.), *Forgiveness: Theory, research, and practice* (pp. 1-14). New York: The Guilford Press.
- Meacham, J. A. (1990). The Loss of Wisdom (pp. 181–211). In *Wisdom: It's Nature, Origins, and Development*, edited by R. J. Sternberg. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Origins, and Development, edited by R. J. Sternberg. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.
- Mei, M. Q. (2012). Customer Orientation and Organizational Responsiveness Paper Presented at the Druid Academy 2012 on Venue: University of Cambridge / The Moeller Centre
- Mello, J. (2011). *Strategic human resource management*, (3rd ed.). South-Western Cengage Learning, Mason, OH.
- Meyer, J. P., & Allen, N. J. (1984). Testing the "Side-Bet Theory" of Organizational Commitment: Some Methodological Considerations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 69(3), 372-378.
- Morrison, R. F., & Hall, D. T. (2002). Career adaptability. In D. T. Hall (Ed.), *Careers in and out of organizations* (pp. 205–233). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Moon, T. W., Hur, W. M., Ko, S. H., Kim, J. W., & Yoon, S. W. (2015). Positive work-related identity as a media-

- tor of the relationship between compassion at work and employee outcomes. *Human Factors and Ergonomics in Manufacturing & Service Industries*, 1-11.
- Moorman, R. H. (1991). Relationship between organizational justice and organizational citizenship behaviors: Do fairness perceptions influence employee citizenship? *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 76, 845-855. Retrieved from <http://dx.doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.76.6.845>
- Mowday, R. T., Porter, L. W., & Steers, R. M. (1982). *Employee-organization linkages The psychology of commitment, absenteeism, and turnover* New York: Academic Press
- Mowday, R., Steers, R., & Porter, L. (1979). The measurement of organizational commitment. *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 14, 224-247.
- Moye, N. A., Masterson, S. S., & Bartol, K. M. (1997). Differentiating antecedents and consequences of procedural and interactional justice: Empirical evidence in support of separate constructs. Presented at the 56th Annual Meeting of the National Academy of Management, Boston, MA.
- Muller, A., & Whiteman, G. (2010). The human focus of organizations: Corporate disaster response as organizational compassion. Working paper, University of Washington
- Niehoff, B. P., & Moorman, R. H. (1993). Justice as a mediator of the relationship between methods of monitoring and organizational citizenship behaviors. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36, 527-556.
- Norton, P. J., & Weiss, B. J. (2009). The role of courage on behavioral approach in a fear-eliciting situation: A proof-of-concept pilot study. *Journal of Anxiety Disorders*, 23, 212-217.
- Norton, P. J., & Weiss, B. J. B. S. (2010). The role of courage on behavioral approach in a fear-eliciting situation: a proof-of-concept pilot study. *Journal of Anxiety Disorder*. Author manuscript; available in PMC, 2010 March 1.
- Ogunnaike, O. O. & Kehinde, O. J. (2011). Assessing Relationship between Personal Value and Customer Satisfaction: Evidence from Nigerian Banking Industry, The Annals of The "Ștefan cel Mare" University of Suceava. *Fascicle of the Faculty of Economics and Public Administration*, 11, 1(13).
- Parasuraman, V. A., Zeithaml, & Berry, L. L. (1988). SERVQUAL: A multi-item scale for measuring consumer perceptions of service quality. *Journal of Retailing*, 64(1), 12-40.
- Peterson, C. & Seligman, M. E. P. (2004). *Character Strengths and Virtues: A Handbook and Classification* (American Psychological Association and Oxford University Press, Washington).
- Piedmont, R. L. (1999). Does spirituality represent the sixth factor of personality? Spiritual transcendence and the five-factor model. *Journal of Personality*, 67, 985-1013.
- Pommier, E. A. (2011). The compassion scale. Dissertation Abstracts International Section A: Humanities and Social Sciences, 72, 1174.
- Porter, L. W., Steers, R. M., Mowday, R. T., & Bouhan, P. V. (1974). Organizational commitment, job satisfaction, and turnover among psychiatric technicians. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59, 603-609
- Prosad, J. M., Kapoor, S., & Sengupta, J. (2015). Exploring optimism and pessimism in the Indian equity market. *Review of Behavioral Finance*, 7(1), 60-77
- Quinn, R. P., & Staines, G. L. (1979). *The 1977 quality of employment survey*. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research.
- Redmond, M. R., Mumford, M. D., & Teach, R. (1993). Putting creativity to work: Effects of leader behavior on subordinate creativity. *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 55, 120-151.
- Rehman, S., Shareef, A., & Ishaque, A. (2012). Role of trust and commitment in creating profitable relationship with customers. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research In Business*, 4(1).
- Reed, P. G. (1991). Self-transcendence and mental health in oldest-old adults. *Nursing Research*, 40(1), 5-11.
- Riggio, R. E. (2011). Four qualities leaders need for success: Four qualities most successful leaders possess. *Psychology Today* blog: *Cutting-Edge Leadership*. Retrieved from www.psychologytoday.com/blog/cutting-edge-leadership/201102/four-qualities-leaders-need-success
- Rupp, D. E. (2011). An employee-centered model of organizational justice and social responsibility. *Organizational Psychology Review*, 1, 72-94.
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Self-determination theory and the facilitation of intrinsic motivation, social development and well-being. *American Psychologist*, 55, 68-78.
- Rye, M. S., Loiacono, D. M., Folck, C. D., Olszewski, B. T., Heim, T. A., & Madia, B. P. (2001). Evaluation of the psychometric properties of two forgiveness scales. *Current Psychology*, 20, 260-277.
- Scheier, M. F., & Carver, C. S. (1993). On the power of positive thinking: The benefits of being optimistic. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 2, 26-30.
- Scheier, M. F., Carver, C. S., & Bridges, M. W. (1994). Distinguishing optimism from neuroticism (and trait anxiety, self-mastery, and self-esteem): A reevaluation of the Life Orientation Test. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 67, 1063-1078.

- Scheier, M. F., Carver, C. S., & Bridges, M. W. (2001). Optimism, pessimism, and psychological well-being. In E. C. Chang (Ed.), *Optimism and pessimism: Implications for theory, research, and practice* (pp. 189-216). Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.
- Schweizer, K., Wolfgang, R., & Andreas, G. (2011). Bipolar items for the measurement of personal optimism instead of unipolar items. *Psychological Test and Assessment Modeling*, 53(4), 399-413.
- Scott, W. R. (2004). Institutional theory (pp. 408-14). In *Encyclopedia of Social Theory*, George Ritzer, ed. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.
- Scott, S. G., & Bruce, R. A. (1994). Determinants of innovative behavior: A path model of individual innovation in the workplace. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38, 1442-1465.
- Schmidt, N. B., & Koselka, M. (2000). Gender differences in patients with panic disorder: Evaluating cognitive mediation of phobic avoidance. *Cognitive Therapy and Research*, 24(5), 531-548.
- Schmit, D. E., Muldoon, J., & Kate, P. (2012). What is wisdom? The development and validation of a multidimensional measure. *Journal of Leadership, Accountability and Ethics*, 9(2).
- Schneider, S. L. (2001). In search of realistic optimism. *American Psychologist*, 65(3) 250-263.
- Shalley, C. E., & Gilson, L. L. (2004). What leaders need to know: a review of social and contextual factors that can foster or hinder creativity. *Leadership Quarterly*, 15(1), 33-53.
- Shelp, E. E. (1984). Courage: A neglected virtue in the patient-physician relationship. *Social Science and Medicine*, 18, 351-360.
- Shoham, A., & Rose, G. M., (2001). Marketing orientation: A replication and extension. *Journal of Global Marketing*, 14(4), 2-25.
- Siegel, S. M., & Kaemmerer, W. F. (1978). Measuring the perceived support for innovation in organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 63(5), 553-562.
- Sinclair S., Norris, J. M., McConnell, S. J., Chochinov, H. M., Hack, T. F., Hagen, N. A., McClement, S., & Bouchal, S. R. (2016) *Compassion: A scoping review of the healthcare literature Sinclair et al. BMC Palliative Care* 15(6) Special Eurobarometer 397, 2014. Retrieved from http://ec.europa.eu/public_opinion/archives/ebs/ebs_397_en.pdf
- Smith, W. K., & Lewis, M. W. (2011). Towards a theory of paradox: A dynamic equilibrium model of organizing. *The Academy of Management Review*, 36(2), 381-403.
- Smith, A., & Mpinganjira, M. (2015). The role of perceived justice in service recovery on banking customers' satisfaction and behavioral intentions: A case of South Africa. *Banks and Bank Systems*, 10(2).
- Sosik, J. J., & Cameron, J. C. (2010). Character and authentic transformational leadership behavior: expanding the ascetic self toward others. *Consulting Psychology Journal*, 62(4), 251-269.
- Stamm, B. H. (2002). Measuring compassion satisfaction as well as fatigue: Developmental history of the compassion satisfaction and fatigue test. In C. R. Figley (Ed.), *Treating compassion fatigue* (pp. 107-119). New York: Brunner-Routledge.
- Staw, B. M., Sandelands, L. E., & Dutton, J. E. (1981). Threat-rigidity effects in organizational behavior: A multilevel analysis. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 26(4), 501-524.
- Steinberg, L., & Cauffman, E. (1996). Maturity of judgment in adolescence: Psychosocial factors in adolescent decision making. *Law and Human Behavior*, 20, 249-272.
- Sternberg, R. J. (1990). *Wisdom: Its nature, origins, and development*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Strickland, L. H. (1958). Surveillance and trust. *Journal of Personality*, 26, 200-215.
- Tack, W. L. (1986). Don't ignore seasoned managers: The case for management cycling. *Sloan Management Review*, 27(4), 63-70.
- Tangney, J. P., Baumeister, R. F., & Boone, A. L. (2004). High self-control predicts good adjustment, less pathology, better grades, and interpersonal success. *Journal of Personality*, 72(2), 271-324.
- Taylor, M., Bates, G., & Webster, J. D. (2011). Comparing the psycho Metric properties of two measures of wisdom: predicting forgiveness and psychological well-being with the self-assessed wisdom scale (SAWS) and the three-dimensional Wisdom scale (3D-WS). *Exp. Aging Res.*, 37, 129-141. doi: 10.1080/0361073X.2011.554508
- Thompson, L. Y., Snyder, C. R., Hoffman, L., Michael, S. T., Rasmussen, H. N., & Billings, L. S. (2005). Dispositional forgiveness of self, others, and situations. *Journal of Personality*, 73, 313-359.
- Torabipor, A., & Rekab, E. S. (2009). Self-evaluation based on EFQM organizational transcendence model in Ahvaz hospitals. *J. Heal. Info. Man*, 8(2), 1-9.
- Torpie, K. (2014). Customer service vs. Patient care. *Patient Experience Journal*, 1(2), Article 3. Retrieved from <http://pxjournal.org/journal/vol1/iss2/3>
- Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and motivation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass
- Wang, C. L., & Ahmed, P. K. (2004). The development and validation of the organisational innovativeness construct using confirmatory factor analysis. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 7(4), 303-313.

- Webster, J. D. (2003). An exploratory analysis of a self-assessed wisdom scale. *Journal of Adult Development*, 10, 13-22.
- Webster, J. D. (2007). Measuring the character strength of wisdom. *Int. J. Aging Hum. Dev.*, 65, 163-183. doi: 10.2190/AG.65.2.d
- Weiner, B. (1986). *An attributional theory of motivation and emotion*. New York: Springer-Verlag.
- Weinstein, N. D. (1980). Unrealistic optimism about future life events. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 39, 806-820.
- West, M. A. (1987). A measure of role innovation at work. *British Journal of Social Psychology*, 6, 83-85.
- White, J. C., Varadarajan, P. R., & Dacin, P. A. (2003). Market situation interpretation and response: The role of cognitive style, Organizational culture, and information use. *Journal of Marketing*, 67(3), 63-79.
- Witvliet, C. V. O. (2001). Forgiveness and health: Review and reflections on a matter of faith, feelings, and physiology. *Journal of Psychology and Theology*, 29, 212-224.
- Woodard, C. R. (2004). Hardiness and the concept of courage. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research*, 56, 173-185.
- Woodman, R. W., Sawyer, J. E., & Griffin, R. W. (1993). Toward a theory of organizational creativity. *Academy of Management Review*, 18(2), 293-321.
- Zeithaml, V. A., Bitner, M. J., & Gremler, D. D. (2006). *Services marketing: Integrating customer focus across the firm* (4th Ed.), (pp. 117). Singapore: McGraw-Hill.