African Social Science Review

Volume 10 | Number 1 Article 6

May 2019

Organizational Virtuousness: The Customers' Perspective

Joshua -. Gukiina Mr.
Makerere University Business School, gukiina_gukiina@yahoo.com

Joseph M. Ntayi
Makerere University Business School

Waswa Balunywa
Makerere University Business School

Augustine Ahiauzu
Rivers State University of Science & Technology

Organizational Virtuousness: The Customers' Perspective

Cover Page Footnote

-

African Social Science Review Volume 10, Number 1, Spring 2019

Organizational Virtuousness: The Customers' Perspective

Joshua Gukiina
Joseph M. Ntayi
Waswa Balunywa
Makerere University Business School

Augustine Ahiauzu
Rivers State University of Science & Technology

Abstract: *This paper reviews the literature on organizational virtues to construct a concept of organizational virtuousness from the perspective of customers. Definitions of organizational virtuousness are missing important virtues and fail to consider the views of customers, who benefit from virtuous organizations, at least as asserted by the extant literature. This paper is theoretical, not empirical. The ideas come from an array of disciplines and include virtues not presently considered in the organizational virtue literature. In addition, the paper emphasizes the perspectives of customers, a dimension missing from existing studies.*

Keywords: Organizational virtuousness, optimism, trust, compassion, forgiveness, wisdom, courage, justice, temperance, transcendence, commitment, responsiveness and innovativeness.

Cameron, Bright, and Caza (2004) are early developers of the concept of organizational virtue. The concept of virtue comes from the Latin word *virtus*, which means ''strength'' or ''excellence" (Arjoon, 2010). Virtues denote unique habits, yearnings, and actions that indicate personal and social good (Aristotle, 1999/250 B.C.). They signal a triumph of humanity or the attainment of one's full potential (Arjoon, 2010), but not at the expense of the common good. Peterson and Seligman (2004) identify wisdom, courage, humanity, justice, temperance, and transcendence as key virtues. As an extension, virtuousness refers to a state of utmost goodness of character (Bright et al., 2006). Organizational virtuousness means contextualized excellent qualities, such as compassion, integrity, forgiveness, and trust (Cameron et al., 2004). In a virtuous organization, similarly minded people pursue shared objectives which organizational life can provide; they willfully harness efforts to reduce human suffering (Balliett & Kevin, 2011).

Organizational virtue is rooted in the theory of virtue developed by Aristotle (Crockett, 2005). This theory posits that individuals possess virtuous individual traits, such as wisdom, courage, humanity, justice, temperance, transcendence, optimism, trust, compassion, integrity, and forgiveness (Peterson and Seligman, 2004; Cameron et al., 2004). With these behavioral characteristics, individuals can ensure their organizations become virtuous, because virtuous individual traits can build virtuousness in organizations (Cameron et al., 2004). At a macro level, organizations can engender virtuousness by enacting virtuous practices in their overall strategic plans (Mello, 2011). Caza et al. (2004) note that conscious organizations can create institutional frameworks that perpetuate virtuousness. Chun (2005) argues that organizations become virtuous by following the Aristotelian view of how a good person should live (Flynn, 2007). In this respect, individual virtue can be used by organizations, if they set standards of excellence they can consciously enforce in an effort to prompt virtue.

However, a critical examination of the literature on organizational virtue reveals prominent flaws in the development of the concept. First, some virtues that are organizational in nature have been ignored in the definition of the concept. These include organizational commitment (Malik et al., 2010; Meyer & Allen, 1987), organizational responsiveness (Parasuraman et al., 1988), and organizational innovativeness (Woodman et al., 1993). Second, a variety of virtues that merit consideration are scattered in the marketing and organization behavior literature and have not been incorporated into analyses of organizational virtue. Third, different scholars have identified different virtues needed for organizational virtue. Cameron et al. (2004) operationalized the concept using optimism, trust, compassion, integrity, and forgiveness as its dimensions, while Peterson and Seligman (2004) and Sosik and Cameron (2010) incorporated wisdom, courage, humanity, justice, temperance, and transcendence. According to Evans et al. (2008) and Mayer and Davis (1999), integrity and competence are dimensions of trust, while humanity is a dimension of compassion (Pommier, 2011). These disparate virtues should be incorporated into our understanding of organizational virtue. Finally, Gotsis & Grimani (2015) point to the need to extend the scholarship on organizational virtuousness by considering the perspective of inter-organizational actors, such as customers, supply chain managers, and competitors, because they play a role in engendering virtuousness. Most existing studies focus on the views of employees and their supervisors to determine organizational virtuousness. The objectives of this article are twofold: (a) document the literature on virtues to facilitate the progressive development of the concept, and (b) suggest that the perspectives of customers be included in our understanding of organizational virtuousness.

Literature review

Articles on organizational virtue can be placed in two categories. First is the literature on virtues that operationalizes the concept of organizational virtuousness. Second is the literature that does not operationalize the virtues. Additionally, organizational virtuousness has been conceptualized and operationalized based on responses from employees and their supervisors, not customers nor inter-organizational actors, such as suppliers and competitors. The following review is divided into the operationalized and un-operationalized categories. Within each of these two categories, articles are grouped by specific virtues, such as optimism, trust, and compassion. The relevance of each virtue to customers is also explored. In addition to developing the role of customers in determining organizational virtue, this review seeks to advance scholarship on positive organizational culture.

Literature reviewed about virtues that currently constitute the concept of organizational virtuousness and their relevance to customers.

Prime of the virtues that have been extrapolated to operationalize the macro concept of organizational virtuousness are: optimism, trust, compassion, and forgiveness, wisdom, courage, justice, temperance and transcendence (Cameron et al.; (2004); Peterson and Seligman, (2004); Sosik and Cameron, (2010). Note that a critical review of the attendant literature reveals that integrity and humanity, formally independent constructs of the same variable, are now dimensions of trust and compassion respectively. The following review illustrates their conceptualization.

Optimism: This is a personality trait and it refers to a belief in success regardless of current challenges (Carver et al., 2010). In psychological research, optimism refers to hopeful expectations in a given situation (Scheier & Carver, 1988) and or the general expectancies that are positive (Scheier & Carver, 1993). As a philosophical idea, optimism assumes that human beings have the capacity to arrive at an accurate prediction of the future depending on a consistent interpretation of past and present events. This means that on the basis of a right understanding of the past and present circumstances, the future occurrence(s) happens naturally as anticipated. This is why, because, it is an individual characteristic, some individuals are more expectant of good things than other across a variety of life experiences. To Scheier & Carver (1992), the formulation of an optimistic philosophical position can be traced to the writings of the French philosopher Rene Descartes (1596-1650). It has been studied at a macro level by many scholars. For instance, while examining the presence and impact of optimism in the Indian equity market, Jaya et al., (2015) found out that the Indian equity market was optimistic from the period 2006 to 2011. Besides, James et al., (2011) established that successful executives are always with a possibility to expect positive outcomes (i.e. optimistic) because, it affects their strategic decision making process. In relation to customers, Mann (2014) assessed the optimism of payday loan borrowers in order to avail the first direct evidence of the accuracy of payday loan borrowers' understanding of how the product will be used.

The study reveals that; borrowers have a good understanding of their own use of the loan and that they finally repay their loans and are free of debt within two weeks of the date they predicted on the date of the loan. This is to signal that optimism theory is applicable to customers. Therefore, quite distinct from previous studies, this study proposes the perspective of customers in rating the optimism of their organizations. This is because; these people have a constant interaction with the staff of these organizations and receive services from them and, no organization whatever the form lacks customers. However, even when optimism is expected of an employee if he or she is to deal better with his or her colleagues and customers, Weinstein, (1980) long established that human judgment is biased when estimating personal risk because, by nature people overestimate their chances of encountering success. This is what is termed as 'unrealistic optimism. Therefore, on the basis of this observation, Sharot and colleagues (Sharot, Guitart-Masip et al., 2012; Sharot, Kanai, et al., 2012; Sharot, Korn, et al., 2011) investigated into the neural foundations of optimism. It is now reasoned that people maintain an optimistic view of the future because they intentionally choose to expect good occurrences than bad ones (Sharot et al.,2011).This means that to judge an organization as being optimistic or not on the basis of employees' held view, is in its own right a scholarly controversy. This is why; the study proposes a consideration of the measurement of optimism

African Social Science Review Volume 10, Number 1, Spring 2019

by customers as part of the inter-organizational actors in order to counter the bias. Therefore, we here by propose that:

Proposition 1:. Optimism may be a dimension of organizational virtuousness as determined by customers.

Trust: Frost et al., (1978) believe that it is a tendency to have hope in one's behavior. It refers to the extent to which a person is eager to attribute good intentions to and have confidence in the behaviors of others (Cook & Wall, 1980). It is argued that human trust is instinctual and originated from the willingness to share food in hunter-gatherer societies and the fear of punishment for not doing what is expected of them (Rehman et al., 2012). Generally two types of trust exist in the literature: interpersonal trust, which is trust between people, and system or institutional trust, which is trust in the functioning of organizational, institutional and social systems (Gautschi, 2002). It retains integrity as a dimension (Evans et al., 2008). At a macro level, it is synonymous with organizational loyalty or organizational reliability. At that level, it has been studied in terms of how a leader is expected to be trusted and the fundamental characteristics that employees expect to see in an individual they trust as their leader such as, honesty; dependability; being genuine or authentic; and delivery according to the promise (Lynette, (2009). It has also been examined in terms of its value to an organization because, it is believed to signal happier work places and that management comes to believe that they have a more loyal workforce, not to mention the fact that such employees are more motivated to work and are productive (Lynett, (2009). In relation to customers, organizational trust translates into customer loyalty, which in turn means longer term relationships that lead to commendable business productivity and greater advocacy (Halliburton & Poenaru, 2010). To this extent, organizational trust as a concept is not fallacious. 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. In this regard, if those trusted meet their expectations of beneficial behavior, trust normally increases and if they are not met, trust decreases (Gautschi, 2002). Therefore, trust is not a constant even in organizational life and until now, it is rather challenging to consider trust as a dimension of organizational virtuousness based on the ratings by employees in their respective organizations. Therefore, we propose that:

Proposition 2:. Trust may be a dimension of organizational virtuousness as determined by the customers.

Compassion: This is synonymous with organizational empathy and is understood from a number of perspectives. Goetz, et al., (2010: 351) define compassion as cooperation and protection of the weak and those who suffer. It is an individual or social mentality that is reflected in intentions and the motivation to alleviate distress in others. It retains among others, humanity as a dimension (Pommier, 2011). Organizational compassion refers to the collective noticing, feeling, and responding to pain within the organization (Atkins & Parker, 2012). Organizationally, it has been tested within clinical healthcare systems (Sinclair et al., 2016) although their study revealed limited empirical understanding of compassion in healthcare. Compassion in the workplace is equally significantly related to both individual and organizational functioning (Lilius et al., 2011). In as far as compassion is relevant to customers, Torpie, (2014) observes that as a provider of hospital care, medical organizations need to treat patients as customers. This is because, according to her findings, the delivery of quality healthcare requires both clinical and business acumen and interpersonal relations so as to receive excellent clinical outcomes, financial success, and patient satisfaction. To this extent, compassionate care is relevant to business success. However, compassion in the workplace is related to increased organizational financial, psychological, and social costs (Moon et al., 2015).This is because; the organization normally does a lot to calm down those who are psychologically unstable. This revelation renders compassion a near impossibility in organizations and does not guarantee its free prevalence even when employees and their supervisors associate it with organizations. Therefore, to retain it as a dimension of organizational virtuousness when determined on basis of employees' ratings who suffer from persistent work related stress, still remains a challenge. Nevertheless, we still propose that:

Proposition 3: Compassion may be a dimension of organizational virtuousness as determined by customers.

Forgiveness: The central meaning to all definitions is that forgiveness refers to the positive responses towards the offender (McCullough et al., 1998). It has been studied in relation to organizational life by numerous scholars. For instance while examining the relative importance of forgiveness, Law (2014), believes that forgiveness creates a pleasant working relationship which facilitates a better working environment. To some psychologists forgiveness is a means to the generation of a cooperative organizational culture (Kurzynski, 1998). It facilitates positive thinking, enhances interpersonal relationships and cultivates supportive linkages between stakeholders (Webb et al.; 2013). In doing so, stakeholders, including customers, can have the opportunity to realize the objective for which they are associated with the organization. Furthermore, as a concept in business, forgiveness is of relevance to firms. For instance, Joireman et al.; (2016) have observed that customers need to learn to forgive firms for their transgressions because; some failures are simply minor issues that should be expected while others are severe. This means that forgiveness is regarded to be of value to customers. However, forgiveness has been found to cause repeated offenses, particularly in organizations which have fair and formal procedures (Exline et al.; 2003). Besides, even when religious prescriptions of forgiveness and compassion (Witvliet, 2001) exist, a look at the world around us demonstrates that people often have difficulty in forgiving others regardless of their religious backgrounds. Therefore, forgiveness like the case with other dimensions of organizational virtuousness examined, is not guaranteed even in organizations because, employees and supervisors as individuals may not be forgiving as well. Therefore, we still propose that:

Proposition 4: Forgiveness may be a dimension of organizational virtuousness as determined by customers.

Wisdom: Meacham (1990) defines it as the awareness of ignorance while Baltes & Staudinger (2000), look at it is a kind of capability in the conduct and meaning of life. According to Ardelt (2003), wisdom is both an implicit and explicit concept. In this way, implicit theories consider wisdom to be a characteristic of a wise individual (Baltes & Smith, 2008) and as such, a micro concept. Explicit theories look at wisdom as a characteristic of people based on the way they are productive beyond merely as individuals. These theories project wisdom as indicated by what one does in a particular context (Webster, 2003). This means that a particular context can define one's wisdom. According to Baltes & Smith, (2008) such expert knowledge is manifested in human behavior and decision making. This is what qualifies wisdom as an organizational concept, where it refers to the managerial cycles through which employees are provided with knowledge (Tack, 1986).The understanding is that when employees are provided with the requisite knowledge, they acquire the know how so as to serve the stakeholders better. Therefore, wisdom has been studied at an organizational level although its measurement has been based on the views suggested by employees and their supervisors and not customers at all. Note that according to Bagozzi et al.; (2010), salespeople work directly with customers and as such, they 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, we propose that:

Proposition 5: Wisdom is a dimension of organizational 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. Rachman (1984) believes that courage is the equivalence of resilience in the face of a threat or danger. This virtue has already been measured at an organizational level by researchers asking employees to report on their observation of courageous acts performed by other colleagues (Cavanagh & Moberg 1999). It is considered both a moral and a practical matter for leaders because, if they lack it, they become greedy and self-interested to the extent that they cannot stand for the common good (John, 2004). Even when courage is an individual virtue, a demonstration has been made to qualify courage as an organizational virtue by Perme (1993), when she argued that organizations are merely people linked together by a network of activity towards a common goal. Therefore, she recommends that in order to build organizational courage, there is need to be true to its vision and values while living to the current reality, despair, and fears (Perme, 1993). Interestingly, courage is equally of relevance to customers. This is because, organizations rely on employees to display courage when undertaking their job tasks and interacting with customers, team members and subordinates. As such, courage plays a pivotal role in ensuring that company representatives accurately reflect organizational values, policies and procedures. This is why, companies that enshrine courage in their sales, customer service, or leadership, are classified as effective and efficient because, they insist on a core set of principles (Acclivus, 2014). Therefore, we propose that:

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

Justice: This has mainly been studied as a macro concept. It refers to employee perceptions of fairness in the workplace (Brockner, 2010). These perceptions can be classified into three categories: distributive, procedural, and interactional. Distributive justice refers to the perceived fairness of the outcomes that an individual receives from the organization. Based on equality, need or contribution, individuals determine the fairness of the distribution through comparison with others (Alsalem & Alhaiani, 2007). Therefore, distributive justice denotes perceptions regarding fairness of outcomes. Procedural justice reflects perceptions of processes that lead to these outcomes. It refers to participants' perceptions of the fairness of the rules and procedures that regulate a process (Nabatchi et al., 2007). Interactional Justice is the quality of interpersonal treatment received during the enactment of organizational procedures (Bies & Moag, 1986). Interactional or Interpersonal justice reflects perceptions of interpersonal interactions and treatment as believed to be existent within an organization. With organizational justice, employees become more satisfied because, they feel that they are fairly rewarded for the work they do. The rewards usually include benefits and privileges other than monetary gains. Indeed, employees with higher job satisfaction feel important because they believe that the organization stands by them and it demonstrates that it cares about the quality of their work (Rupp, 2011). Therefore, they are usually more committed to the organization and are highly retained and productive (Fatt et al., 2010). It is out of this mindset that stake holder satisfaction becomes inevitable and business success is quite handy. However, because organizations have a limited amount of wealth and resources, the question of how those benefits ought to be distributed frequently arises (De Matos et al., 2013). This means that it is a challenge to be fair in face of limited resources even in organizational settings. Therefore, justice in organizations is equally debatable. However, justice perceptions are of importance to a customer. For instance in a study by Smith & Mpinganjira (2015), the findings indicate that procedural, interactional and distributive justice perceptions by customers of banks, positively influence their satisfaction and behavioral intentions. Nevertheless, we propose that:

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

Temperance: This is the ability to control impulses, including those that are aggressive (Steinberg & Cauffman, 1996). It is the ability to take constructive decisions in all circumstances (Wiersbe, 1989). It has been associated with organizational settings by scholars in various ways. For instance, Neubert, et al., (2009) argues that appropriate ethical leaders and their followers demonstrate specific qualities such as love, faithfulness, temperance, and justice". This is why leaders have to be self-disciplined in their interactions with equals, supervisors, and subordinates. Organizationally still, possession of temperance enables leaders to think twice before they can take any actions and short of this, they can easily become greedy and could lack self-control, (Riggio, 2011). To this extent, since temperance is organizational, there is need for organizations to recruit people who are mentally stable at all times so as to be in position to take decisions that transform those organizations that are visionary. In relation to customers, self-control has been found to be of relevance to consumers because, in a study by Haws, Bearden, and Nenkov (2012), lack of control makes consumers reduce their purchasing power. This is an eye opener to the rational consumers if they are to obtain value for the money that they spend. We can as such propose that:

Proposition 8: Temperance is a dimension of organizational virtuousness as assessed by customers.

Transcendence: This is the quest for perfectionism (Jarzabkowski et al., 2013). Ideally, the way people seek for excellence in all that they do using their own means, is equally what organizations do in an effort to ensure quality performance (Torabipor & Rekab, 2009). In doing so, organizations devise unique ways and means that are not directly those of their individual members (Smith & Lewis, 2011). This means that the concept organizational transcendence is existent quite apart from self transcendence and this explains the existence of independent structured approaches to the attainment of the common organizational goals. Organizational transcendence is well illustrated in situations where individual efforts significantly stifle collective efforts in the attainment of collective goals (Jarzabkowski et al., 2013). In such situations, managers come up with appropriate interventions that are reasonably intended to reconcile efforts to cope with the paradox at hand so as to address the objectives of each stakeholder including customers (Lewis & Smith, 2014). This is how organizational efficiency and effectiveness is associated with the observed desire by stakeholders to achieve excellence in productivity. Therefore, to this extent, organizational transcendence is a reality only that an objective assessment of its existence in particular organizations is lacking since it has been rated from the point of view of employees. As far as its relationship with customers is concerned self-transcendence has a positive relationship with customer satisfaction (Ogunnaike & Kehinde (2011). This stresses the role of transcendence theory on customers. Therefore, we propose that:

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

Literature reviewed on virtues that are not considered in the operationalization and measurement of the concept organizational virtuousness to date.

Scholars such as Cameron, (2003); Cameron et al., (2004); Peterson & Seligman, (2004) have operationalized the concept of organizational virtuousness based on the averaged views of employees and their supervisors. Interestingly, certain prominent virtues have been neglected in the construction of the concept even when they are associated with organizational life besides being of relevance to customers. In the circumstance, the review that follows is a reflection on the conceptualization of those neglected virtues and how they are of relevance to customers. The list is not exhaustive as alluded to earlier but the most prominent include: commitment (Meyer & Allen, 1987), responsiveness (Parasuraman et al., 1988), and innovativeness (Woodman et al., 1993). Humanity that should have been considered as an independent construct is now a dimension of compassion. Their review is as follows:

Commitment: It is believed that commitment is a human and organizational attribute (Malik et al., 2010; Meyer & Allen, 1987). Clients feel satisfied with an organization whose employees are committed because, affectively they continue working with great devotion on a voluntary basis, those with continuance commitment ensure that they retain their organizational membership, just as those who are normally committed usually feel an obligation to stay in the organization (Malik et al., 2010; Meyer & Allen, 1987). An organizational commitment model developed by Meyer & Allen (1987) has three approaches and these are 'affective', 'continuance' and 'normative' commitment, respectively. These approaches suggest a scientific relationship between employees and the organization that they work for because, committed employees decrease the likelihood of turnover and the level of productivity of the social system (Meyer & Allen, 1987). Unfortunately, while the understanding of commitment in this regard, is a reflection of the views held by both customers and employees of a particular organization, it is important to note that the current operational definition and measurement of organizational virtuousness is deficient of commitment as a dimension yet as specified, a virtuous organization from the customers point of view is considerate of the level of commitment of the employees. Therefore, it is in order that we propose that:

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

Responsiveness: This is one of the virtues that customers need to find in a virtuous organization (Parasuraman et al., 1988). It is synonymous with organizational adaptability (Morrison & Hall, 2002). At an organizational level, it is conceptualized as a firm‘s likelihood to act based on the known customers’ preferences (Hult et al., 2005; Kohli & Jaworski 1990). Considering the view of market information process, Kohli & Jaworski (1990), look at organizational responsiveness as being intimately related to information utilization within the organization. These authors further identify several forms of organizational responsiveness such as: selecting target markets, designing and offering products or services that cater for customers‘current and anticipated needs, and producing, distributing, and promoting the products in a way that in return cements a good organization-customer relationship (Kohli & Jaworski 1990). This is probably the reason as to why, Parasuraman et al. (1988), defines responsiveness as the employees’ expression of willingness to help customers and provide quick service. It is concerned with addressing customers’ concerns in time. This is because, when an organization communicates to its customers, this is aimed at being responsive. It is of no wonder that, if an organization wants to be successful, it needs to consider customers preferences and not its own wishes (Zeithaml et al., 2006).Therefore, the fact that responsiveness is both an individual and organizational virtue that customers wish to locate in the organization they associate wish (Parasuraman et al., 1988), we propose that:

African Social Science Review Volume 10, Number 1, Spring 2019

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

Innovativeness: It is both a micro and macro concept. At the macro level, it is the formation of superior valuable new products or services within an organizational context (Woodman et al., 1993). It is the tendency of the organization to come up with high quality products or services and the success of that particular organization to pass on those products or services to the consumers. Innovativeness is a human characteristic just as organizations have been established to be. It has been studied in terms of a Leader's ability to inspire and arouse critical individual follower and subsequently, organizational innovation (Elkins & Keller, 2003). This is why it is possible to classify leaders as being transformational in nature because, such individuals generate creative ideas within organizations that they superintend (Howell & Higgins, 1990). Indeed, such leaders are visionary and motivate their subordinates, enhance their willingness to perform beyond expectations, and call upon them to adopt innovative ways of doing things anew in their work. An individual originates new ideas (Redmond et al., 1993) and is the basis for organizational innovation (Shalley & Gilson, 2004). Therefore, since the customer benefits from the innovativeness of the employees through accessibility to new and better quality products, the aggregate innovativeness of the organization as a whole is a virtue that the customer would love to find in an organization of choice. This is because, to Shalley et al., (2004) the creative new ideas of employees are eventually passed on to colleagues in the organization hence setting the pace for organizational innovativeness. In this regard, we are bound to propose that:

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

Methodology

This was literature search. Out of this endeavor, the articles that were reviewed in our theoretical paper were identified after conducting a computerized search of Google scholar and PubMed as databases using the key words: organizational 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). We were careful enough to consider only those that retained the catch word(s). The researchers were critical enough to only obtain from the articles, the meaning of each of the key terms above; its dimensions at both the individual and organizational levels where appropriate. The search for those virtues identified was in two forms: Firstly, were articles on those virtues that are already constructs of the term organizational virtuousness. These are: optimism, trust, compassion, forgiveness, wisdom, courage, justice, temperance, transcendence. Secondly, were articles about those virtues that are organizational in nature but have not been considered in the initial factor structure of the concept organizational virtuousness. These are: commitment, responsiveness and innovativeness. We also obtained articles that indicated a significance of the identified virtues to customers. The purpose was to advance the argument that customers find each of the virtues above as being important and as such, have the ability to assess the extent to which any organization they interact with is virtuous or not in an effort to construct the concept organizational virtuousness from their own perspective (Gotsis & Grimani, 2015). The total number of articles obtained was 277 (Two hundred seventy seven).

Discussion

Each of the virtues examined above, has been studied at both the individual and organizational levels. The discussion below is an appreciation of the dimensionality of each of the virtues at both levels based on the data that was obtained from a single source that is; the employees and their supervisors. The conclusion of each virtue ends with the most plausible of the dimensions to be adopted at the macro level. The discussion per virtue follows:

Optimism: As noted already, optimism has been studied at both the individual (Scheier et al., 2001; Schweizer et al., 2011) and organizational level (Beheshtifar, 2013; Gabris, et al., 1998; Fredrickson's (1998). However, until now, studies are sparse which propose that this construct is multidimensional in nature regardless of the level at which it has been investigated. Instead, micro measurement items exist and have simply been extrapolated to measure optimism at a macro level although, ratings of the same has been by employees and their supervisors. However, as already indicated, optimism is of value to customers (Mann, 2014) and if the concept is to be studied from the perspective of customers, it is hereby recommended that existing micro measurement items as those adopted by (Beheshtifar, 2013) and utilized at the macro level, need to be maintained and customized so as to to measure optimism at a macro level from the perspective of customers. This is because; these people have a constant interaction with the staff of these organizations and receive services from them and, no organization whatever the form lacks customers.

Trust: Like any other virtue, trust has been studied at both the micro and macro levels. At the micro level, trust has manifested it self as a three dimensional variable. These are: Competence (ability), Benevolence and Integrity (Evans et al., 2008). In a related study by, Dietz and Hartog (2006), they indicate trust has four dimensions and these are: competence, benevolence, integrity, intention to act, predictability, and identification. It is these that have been studied at both the micro and macro levels by way of modifying their associated measurement items. In this regard, trust is a multidimensional concept whose formulation has equally been based on the data that has been obtained from employees and their supervisors in an effort to establish the existence of this virtue in an organizational context. The dimensions administered by Dietz and Hartog (2006) at a macro level, could be modified to suit the perspective of customers since until now; trust translates into customer loyalty, which in turn means longer term relationships that lead to commendable business productivity and greater advocacy (Halliburton & Poenaru, 2010). To this end, trust is of relevance to customers as well.

Compassion: The researchers recognize the fact that compassion has equally been studied before today at the level of the individual and the organization. At the micro level, it has been studied as self-compassion and at the macro level, as compassion for others. Self-compassion denotes being touched by one's own suffering, generating the desire to alleviate one's suffering so as to treat oneself with understanding and concern (Goetz et al., 2010). Self-compassion has been assessed using the 12-item SCS-short form (Raes, et al., 2011). This has three subscales and they are: Self-Kindness, Self-Judgment, and Common Humanity. At the organizational level, there is The Compassion Scale (Pommier, 2011), which assesses compassion for others along similar dimensions as self-compassion. This scale includes six subscales and these are: Kindness; Indifference; Common Humanity; Separation; Mindfulness; and Disengagement. Still at the organizational level, compassion has been studied by scholars such as Cameron et al., (2004), and McLelland (2010) while Muller & Whiteman (2010), suggest that an institution‘s level of corporate philanthropy is a reflection of its organizational compassion. This means that the measurement of a corporate philanthropy or corporate citizenship or corporate social responsibility, is a measurement of organization compassion. The Compassion Scale (Pommier, 2011), could be adopted by 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 since compassion is still relevant to customers (Torpie, 2014).

Forgiveness: Forgiveness has been studied at both an individual and organizational level. At the individual level, self-report scales for measuring forgiveness for specific offenses exist (Rye et al., 2001; McCullough et al., 1998). There is also the Transgression-Related Interpersonal Motivations (TRIM) Inventory, the Heartland Forgiveness Scale (Thompson et al., 2005) among others. However, latest scholars such as Boonyarit et al.; (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 Belief 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 organizational forgiveness. The irony with these as reiterated is that they have utilized data from employees and their supervisors to the extent that they are believed to be biased (Gotsis & Grimani, 2015). This study proposes Boonyarit et al.; (2013) four dimensional scale that has already been applied at the macro level and could only be modified to elicit customers’ views since forgiveness as a concept is still relevant (Joireman et al.; 2016).

Wisdom: Prominent scholars of wisdom such as (Ardelt, 2003) argue that wisdom should be operationalized and measured as a latent variable with cognitive, reflective, and affective elements. The result is that, she developed a three-dimensional wisdom scale (3D-WS) and these are: the cognitive, reflective and affective dimensions. However, 3D-WS was conducted among the elderly and above all; it is more of a measure of wisdom at a personal level. This means that it may not be a suitable tool for the measurement of organizational wisdom. Instead, Schmit et al; (2012), integrated management as well as psychology literature and proposed a multidimensional definition of wisdom that is applicable in a generalized organizational 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 since according to Bagozzi et al.; (2010), wisdom is directly relevant to customers.

Courage: This concept, like any other virtue has been studied at both the micro and macro levels. So far the concept is a one dimensional construct and the measurements at the organizational level have only been a matter of extrapolation. Norton & Weiss (2010) validated measures exist as micro measures of courage while for organizational courage, measures by Hackett and Wang, (2012), Norton and Weiss (2009), serve as common macro measures of courage respectively. The scales by Hackett and Wang, (2012); Norton and Weiss (2009), have already been applied at the organizational level and could be adopted and modified so as to obtain the views of customers since interestingly, organizations rely on employees to display courage when undertaking their job tasks and interacting with customers, team members and subordinates. This implies that courage plays a pivotal role in ensuring that company representatives accurately reflect organizational values, policies and procedures. This is why, companies that enshrine courage in their sales, customer service, or leadership, are classified as effective and efficient because, they insist on a core set of principles, accepting responsibility for one's decisions, and getting alternative perspectives to solve problems Acclivus (2014).Therefore, courage is good even to customers.

Justice: This has mainly been studied at the organizational level and has been conceptualized invariably by scholars. Some conceive it as a three dimensional concept and these are distributive justice, procedural justice and interactional justice (Folger & Konovsky, 1989). Other scholars 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 organizational level. It is these that are hereby recommended for adoption and modification so as to facilitate the extraction of data from customers since justice perceptions are of importance to a customer. For instance in a study by Smith & Mpinganjira (2015), the findings indicate that procedural, interactional and distributive justice perceptions by customers of banks, positively influence their satisfaction and behavioral intentions.

Temperance: This concept has been studied at both the organizational and individual levels. At the organizational level, it refers to an employee's ability to control his or her behaviour or discipline so as to prevent negative outcomes and or to start those actions that could result into positive outcomes. 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 organizational setting. By stop-control, we refer to a form of self-control behaviour that is taken by an individual so as to prevent an action that is likely to result into negative outcomes while start-control is a form of self-control behaviour in which an individual has the ability to initiate an action that could result in positive outcomes (Benjamin et al., 2015). At the individual level, the common Tangney et al., (2004) self-control measures are a one dimensional scale. 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. The scale by (Benjamin et al., (2015) should be adopted and modified so as to be effectively utilized to obtain data from customers since this scale has already been administered at the macro level and, self-control is of relevance to customers because, in a study by Haws (2011), it is stated that a regular factor that has been found to contribute to a reduction in consumer purchasing power, is the lack of control that many consumers have over their own spending. This is an eye opener to the rational consumers if they are to obtain value for the money that they spend.

Transcendence: This concept has equally been studied at both the micro and macro levels. At the micro level, self-transcendence, as indicated by the original Self-transcendence scale of the Temperament and Character Inventory (Cloninger, 1993), is multi-dimensional. 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 Piedmont's (1999) Spiritual Transcendence Scale which is a 24-item scale 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. To talk of organizational transcendence is to refer to a macro level concept of it. Organizational transcendence has been studied using the original Self-transcendence scale of the Temperament and Character Inventory (Cloninger, 1993). It is this scale by (Cloninger, 1993) that has already been organizationally been tested that could be adopted and modified to obtain the views of customers now that Ogunnaike and Kehinde (2011) indicate that that self-transcendence has a positive relationship with customer satisfaction. This stresses the role of transcendence theory on customers.

Commitment: Existing measures of commitment are commonly at the employee level and these translate into the conceptualization of organizational commitment and not individual commitment. Rated by individual employees, commitment has been conceptualized 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, et al, (1979), look at it as a one-dimensional concept. It is those dimensions by (Buchanan, 1974; Quinn & Staines, 1979) that could be retained and be modified to study customers because, they are already organizational in nature and commitment still remains important to a customer and it forms the essence of relationship marketing as a prerequisite for the attraction and satisfaction of the customers' needs (Rehman et al., 2012).

Responsiveness: Mei (2012) conceptualized organizational responsiveness as a seven dimensional construct and these are: threat interpretation, opportunity interpretation, resource rigidity, routine rigidity, technology uncertainty, customer uncertainty and response uncertainty. Organizational responsiveness is also presented as a one-dimensional construct by Kohli, et al., (1993) and a separate study by (De Waard et al., 2013) conceived organizational responsiveness as a one-dimensional concept. This study recommends the scale by Mei (2012) that conceptualized organizational responsiveness as a seven dimensional scale and already tested. It only requires modification so as to capture the views of customers. Indeed, Mei (2012) has already established that there is a positive and significant relationship between customer orientation and organizational responsiveness. This means that a firm's responsiveness is already central to customers' needs.

Innovativeness: At a micro level, studies on innovative characteristics are scanty however, Chell and Athayde (2009) have attempted to come up with a five dimensions model of individual innovativeness and these are: Creativity, Leadership, Energy, Self-efficacy and Risk-propensity. These were arrived at after studying youths in schools and colleges in the United Kingdom. At a macro level, this has been conceptualized differently for instance as having five dimensions and these are: Creativity (Siegel and Kaemmerer, 1978), Openness to change (Siegel and Kaemmerer, 1978), Future orientation (Javidan and Waldman's, 2003), were adopted, Risk-taking by (Shoham and Rose, 2001) and, Proactiveness by Covin and Slevin's (1989). This model is supported by Lynch et al., (2010) who also suggested five factors and listed them as being: 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 macro level, it has equally been conceptualized as Innovative Work Behavior 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 organizational in nature and innovativeness is very central to customers because, it affects the extent to which new product development influences consumer adoption (Amue and Adiele, 2012).

Theoretical implications

Numerous theories have either explicitly or otherwise been put forward to explain the various virtues that are under consideration. Below is presentation of the theoretical debates about each virtue at both the individual and organizational levels. We end with a proposal of the likely appropriate theoretical framework that could be adopted to explain each virtue at a macro level.

Optimism: Regarding optimism, at the micro level, particular studies have suggested that optimism may be correlated with the personality traits such as Neuroticism, Extraversion, or self-esteem (Scheier et al., 2001; Schweizer et al., 2011). This means that personality theory has partly been used to explain the prevalence of optimistic behavior within individuals. This theory is in part the basis for the study of optimism through the direct beliefs that individuals have regarding future life events otherwise called the Life Orientation Test (LOT) by Scheier & Carver, (1985) and the Life Orientation Test Revised (LOT-R) by Scheier et al., (1994). This view is what is referred to as dispositional optimism or the direct belief model. 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., 2000). 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 (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 with its emphasis on expectations (Ciarrocchi & Deneke, 2006), has been viewed as an explanatory framework for organizational optimism. In effect, this theory leads to the argument that by paying attention to the needs of workers, management could expect increases in performance (Gabris, et al., 1998). To Beheshtifar (2013), organizational 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 organization does is by improving 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 the suggestion of this study that the social exchange theory by Blau (1964), that is an encompassing theory at a macro level be used in subsequent studies because, it explains quite a variety of organizational behavior.

Trust: At a micro level, some scholars have argued that trust is equally viewed as a feature of ones' personality which grows in a person (Colquitt, et al., 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 qualifies the expectancy theory of motivation by Vroom, (1964) as an explanation of trust still at a micro level. At a macro level, Kramer (1999) argues that the social exchange theory can ably explain trust using the relational model of trust. In this regard, the social exchange theory is privy in explaining trust at a macro level and this study recommends its adoption for further scholarship on trust at a macro level.

Compassion: Existing empirical research points to the many theoretical frameworks of compassion either at the individual or organizational level. At a micro level, compassion is person specific (Stamm, 2002) and this places the personality theory in compassion theoretical framework. At the macro level, 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, et al., 2010) All these arguments reflect the place of the identity theory and virtue theory in explaining organizational virtuousness. 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 can be used to explain forgiveness behaviour because; McCullough et al. (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: The initial literature on the micro study of wisdom uses implicit theories that individuals have about the nature of wisdom and what is common 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). This places the theoretical backbone of wisdom within the personality theory and virtue theory as well. The second perspective of research on wisdom places it within explicit theories that are 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 curbs impolite or uncivil behavior. 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 voluntary 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 behaviors. 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. Therefore, there is sparse literature on the micro orientation of this variable. At the macro level, Masterson, et al., (2000) used the social exchange theory 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, et al., (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 organizational 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 explanatory capacity.

Temperance: At a macro level, temperance is the result of virtuous people influencing others to be virtuous. The more general concept of control has been important in the work and organizational psychology literature where the Job Demands-Resources Model (JD-R) talk of control (Bakker and 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 the health impairment process. In contrast, job resources foster employee engagement and extra-role performance. This is the motivational process. In this regard, the motivational control implores employees to ensure self-control in face of high job demands.

Transcendence: Transcendence as a virtue has been explained by different theories at both micro and macro levels. 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 behaviors on the basis of innate personal interpretations about life. Self-transcendence implies that a person realizes that he is not immortal and undermines the very essence of individualism and decides on his or her own to glorify God and care for others. In this way, individuals become inherently able 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. To this far, it could be stated that theoretically, self-transcendence is a motivational issue as well as an ethical one. On the one hand, 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. However, 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. To this extent, 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 and Leary, 1995). These needs are the basic ingredients required for psychological health and as such the commitment of an employee. In other words, it is the satisfaction of these needs rather than their strength that determines well-being and employee commitment (Ryan and Deci, 2000). However, at a macro level, identity theory (Mead, 1934) has been drawn into attention. Indeed Porter, et al., (1974), argues that organisational commitment embraces the ideals of identification, involvement and loyalty to an organization. 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; Alluto, et al., 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, et al., (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. The identity theory is a plausible theoretical model for the explanation of organizational commitment and could be utilized for further scholarly endeavours on the same concept.

Responsiveness: At a micro level, to be responsive is a character strength and as such, a virtue. This means that like any virtue, the virtue theory can explain responsiveness. At a macro level, organizational response could be explained by the threat rigidity theory (Staw et al. 1981). This theory argues that successful threat interpretation increases organizational laziness because it forces it to reduce alternatives and concentrate on previous activities (Staw et al., 1981), while the prospect theory (Kahneman & Tversky 1979) conveys the understanding that opportunity perception leads to the detection of noticeable potential gains rather than the risks involved (March and Shapira 1987). Accordingly, Chattopadhyay et al., (2001) argue that in an ambiguous situation threat rigidity theory is strong in predicting threat response while prospect theory works well for opportunity response. The organizational learning theory is equally important in the explanation of organizational responsiveness. This is why; Ketchen & Hult (2007:284) claimed that “responsiveness is dependent on the ability of an organization to learn about changes in its market environment”. This is to recommend the place of the theory of organizational learning in fostering organizational responsiveness. It should be found more relevant in future in explaining organizational responsiveness.

Innovativeness: Individual innovation is a set of personality characteristics, as outputs, and behaviors. Scholars such as Hurt et al., (1977), consider it as generalized 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), conceptualize individual innovation as discretionary employee behaviors and this makes innovation to be explained by organizational behaviour theory, while 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 et al.'s (2000) measures assess individuals' self-ratings of their suggestions and realized innovations. These approaches locate innovation in the performance management theoretical framework. Therefore, to this far, at a micro level, innovativeness can be advanced by personality theory and social learning theory while at the macro level, organizational behaviour theories and performance management theories become handy. To this extent, a prominent theoretical framework of organizational behaviour is social exchange that could be adopted for further scholarship on innovativeness.

Methodological implications

It is herein revealed, the most common methodological orientations of studies on each virtue considered. This has been by way of pointing out: their philosophical perspective that is; whether they followed an objective or subjective view of reality, their designs that is whether they were qualitative or quantitative, longitudinal or cross sectional in nature. We further highlight the existing measurement scales of each virtue at both the micro and macro levels where appropriate besides an indication of the fact that previous studies have been empirical or theoretical in nature. We conclude each virtue by providing possible methodological breakthroughs that future studies could adopt.

Optimism: Some studies have attempted to quantitatively examine optimism within relationships longitudinally. Following a longitudinal design, the study was for as long as a year as a one dimensional variable using the Life Orientation Test (LOT) by Scheier & 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. This means that the philosophical orientation was objective in nature and the design was mixed that is, quantitative and longitudinal. In these studies, sample items included "In uncertain times, I usually expect the best" and the reverse-coded item "If something can go wrong for me, it will." Responses have 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 behavior 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 organizational 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 organizational optimism by customers, a more objective philosophical orientation be pursued 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 hotel, am optimistic that I will succeed, even when faced with major challenges"; "As a customer, the employees of this hotel are dedicated to doing good in addition to doing well"; "As a customer, in uncertain times, i usually expect the best"; "As a customer, it's easy for me to relax.". Items should similarly be anchored on a 5-point Likert measurement scale ranging from "strongly disagree" (1) to "strongly agree" (5).

Trust: The use of a questionnaire formulated and administered to a group of respondents has been the dominant data collection method in what have been mainly quantitative studies of trust. 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 and more effort is needed by a scholar interested to agree on the array of dimensions provided so as to arrive at an operational framework for a study of choice. However, even when the theoretical paper by Dietz and Hartog (2006) is dominant, it just emphasizes the fact that an objective philosophical orientation has been dominant, with a quantitative design let alone a quantitative data collection method of a questionnaire.
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 organizational trust, the existing measures of organizational trust by Clark and Payne (1997) and Mayer and Davis (1999) be adopted and modified as the following sample items suggest: "As a customer, most managers in this hotel 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", "and As a customer, I consider management to be competent when it comes to matters of safety on 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: Respondents have been subjected to numerous scales to assess both individual and macro measurement of compassion. For instance, the recently created Compassion Scale (Pommier, 2011), which assesses compassion for others along similar dimensions as self-compassion. 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."). Research indicates that the scale has an appropriate factor structure and that a single higher order factor of compassion explains the strong inter-correlations among the subscales. At the macro level, the Cameron et al., (2004) sample items are: "Acts of compassion are common here in this organization", "This hotel is characterized by many acts of concern and caring for other people" and "Many stories of compassion and concern circulate among the members on this organization". 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, all those measures by the above scholar could be adopted and modified to tap the construct from the point of view of customers as follows: "As a customer, of compassion are common here in this hotel", "As a customer, this hotel is characterized by many acts of concern and caring for other people", and "As a customer, many stories of compassion and concern circulate among the members of this hotel". The items should similarly be anchored on a 5-point Likert measurement scale ranging from "strongly disagree" (1) to "strongly agree" (5). This is because; this scale provides a neutral middle point which caters for a condition in which a respondent may not have an opinion on the question at hand (Chung Ho Yu, 2008).

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) and

Wade (1989), Boonyarit et al., (2013) and McCullough, et al., (1998), have examined organizational forgiveness as a concept. The philosophical orientation has been objective and a quantitative design. The fact that this study is enriching, it is suggested that the scale by McCullough, et al., (1998) be adopted. This is because, it is already organizational in nature and has been tested and found valid. The items could be modified to appear as suggested below: "As a customer, I feel that employees of this hotel 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 hereby further proposed that future studies on forgiveness be mainly mixed in terms philosophical orientation, designs and methods. This has the advantage of obtaining a more compound set of findings on forgiveness. Relatedly, the items should similarly be anchored on a 5-point Likert measurement scale ranging from "strongly disagree" (1) to "strongly agree" (5). This is because; this scale provides a neutral middle point which caters for a condition in which a respondent may not have an opinion on the question at hand (Chung Ho Yu, 2008).

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 et al., 2011). It consists of 40 items presented with a 6-point Likert scale that ranges from "strongly disagree" to "strongly agree" and Webster (2007) reported a Cronbach's alpha of 0.90. 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). Twenty four (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." Ardelt (2003) reported Cronbach's alpha from 0.71 to 0.85 for the three dimensions. 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 and have been measured by a five-point likert-type scale that has been anchored by "strongly disagree" and "strongly agree. This means that it used an objective philosophical orientation and the design has been quantitative in nature. It is however, recommended that future studies on wisdom be mainly mixed in terms philosophical orientation, designs and methods. This has the advantage of obtaining a more compound set of findings on wisdom.

Courage: Numerous measurement scales exist to measure courage. This means that 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, among the most prominent scales are: The Courage Scale that was recently developed to measure general courage in the absence of a similar measure. Another scale is associated with Woodard (2004). In order to construct a pool of items that would be included in the Courage Scale, 10 experts in psychology were consulted. The pool of items was pre-tested with 10 research participants from varied educational levels, levels of socioeconomic status, ages, and types of employment. In this study by (Woodard, 2004), the Courage Scale developed 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 also 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. It is hereby proposed that there is need to integrate all the measures proposed 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 hotel 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 hotel". "As a customer of this hotel, if the thought of something makes me anxious, I usually will avoid it". The items should similarly be anchored on a 5-point Likert measurement scale ranging from "strongly disagree" (1) to "strongly agree" (5). This is because; this scale provides a neutral middle point which caters for a condition in which a respondent may not have an opinion on the question at hand (Chung Ho Yu, 2008).

Justice: In a study by Colquitt (2001) items that measure each dimension of organizational justice were derived from a review of the seminal works in the justice literature and according to him, this was so careful that it was after unifying similar phenomena so as to manage multicolinearity effects. These items used a 5-point scale with anchors of 1 = to a small extent and 5 = to a large extent. There is also the Moorman (1991) organizational justice scale where procedural and relational justices are measured by 7 items and 6 items respectively as suggested by Elovainio et al., (2002). By use of a questionnaire, 156 of them 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-items. The Neihoff and Moorman (1993) scale is here by recommended 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. This has the advantage of obtaining a more comprehensive report on justice.

Temperance: The study of temperance at both the micro and macro levels has utilized the same measurement scales and associated items. It is only that the micro measurement items have just been extrapolated to apply at the organizational level. For instance, micro measures in a study of self-control by Benjamin et al., (2015); a heterogeneous sample of employees totaling to 231, some of whom having occupied managerial positions and with varying educational backgrounds, was selected. These 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 based on items from previously validated general self-control scales such as the SCS (Tangney et al., 2004), the Self-Control Schedule (Rosenbaum, 1980), and the Ego-Under control scale (Letzring et al., 2005). 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).This means that the self-control measures for the micro level were extrapolated to measure self-control at the macro level. In effect, the philosophical orientation was mainly objective and the design, quantitative in nature. Therefore, we recommend that future studies on self-control be mainly mixed in terms philosophical orientation, designs and methods. This has the advantage of obtaining a more comprehensive report on self-control.

Transcendence: At both the micro and macro levels, different scales of transcendence exist. For instance, at the micro level, there is the original Self-transcendence scale of the Temperament and Character Inventory (Cloninger, 1993) with three sub scales and these are: ST1: (11 items); ST2: (9 items); ST3: (13 items), then the Spiritual Transcendence Scale (STS) by Piedmont's (1999) STS that 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 Center 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 the design has been quantitative in nature. We in the circumstance recommend that future studies on transcendence be mainly mixed in terms philosophical orientation, designs and methods. This has the advantage of obtaining a more comprehensive report on the subject.

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, definitely would (1), uncertain (2) and definitely would not (3). The instruments used were: The Organizational Commitment Questionnaire (Porter et al., 1974; Mowday et al, 1979) with 15-

ltem measure that assessed the affective orientation to the organization 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 organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me" and "I do not feel 'emotionally attached' to this organization" (reversed). The Continuance Commitment Scale is an 8-item measure, assesses the extent to which employees feel committed to their organizations 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 organization right now, even if I wanted to" and "It would not be too costly for me to leave my organization in the near future" (reversed). In all, we observe an objective orientation of the studies before as well as the quantitative design. Therefore, we recommend 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. This has the advantage of obtaining a more comprehensive report on commitment.

Responsiveness: In a study by Mei (2012), organizational 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, we adopted those measures by White et al. (2003); Dutton and Jackson‘s (1987). For resource rigidity (Chandy et al., (1998) and routine rigidity, Douglas and Judge (2001).Regarding technology uncertainty, customer uncertainty (Jaworski and Kohli‘s (1993), and response uncertainty, were those by Milliken (1990). The alternative measures of organizational 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. This study utilized a sample of 1000 SMEs from Washington State to test the hypotheses and responses were collected from 284 companies in the state of Washington. In particular, retailers, wholesalers, finance businesses, transportation companies, construction and agriculture businesses constituted the SMEs. In a separate study (De Waard et al., 2013) organizational 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. This group consisted of majors, lieutenant colonels, and colonels from the three main services: Army, Navy, and Air Force. 3,706 questionnaires were sent to the selected officers' home addresses and within five weeks, 1,533 officers filled out and returned the questionnaire by mail and after cleaning, altogether, the study retained 1,208 usable questionnaires. The items were those as developed by the same authors (De Waard et al., 2013). Apart from specifying the respondents and how many questionnaires were returned, the sampling approach was not indicated. 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. This has the advantage of obtaining a more comprehensive report on the subject.

Innovativeness: The fact that it has been conceptualized by different scholars, numerous measures exist for the varying dimensions of innovativeness and these are: Creativity and its five items (Siegel and Kaemmerer, 1978), Openness to change and the four items by Siegel and Kaemmerer (1978), Future orientation and the four items by Javidan and Waldman's (2003), Risk-taking and the four items by (Shoham and Rose, 2001) and, Proactiveness and the four-item by Covin and Slevin's (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 organizational innovativeness. At a macro level, we have the measures of Innovative Work Behavior by Jong and Hartog (2008) which represent a four dimensional scale of organizational 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 dimensions 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 organizational 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 organizational virtuousness of their related organizations since they have been ignored completely in earlier efforts (Gotsis & Grimani, 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 organizations but have not been considered in the earlier operational definition of organizational virtuousness. With all the above considered systematically, we believe, shall in effect be additions to existing knowledge.

References

Abbas, Z. K., & Parivash, M. (2015). Measuring organizational transcendence in West Azerbaijan Department of Forensic Medicine. *Trends in Life Sciences*, *4*(4).

Achenbaum, A., & Orwoll, L. (1991). Becoming wise: A psycho-gerontological interpretation of the Book of Job. *International Journal of Aging and Human Development, 32*:21–39.

Acclivus R3 Solutions and Training Industry, Inc. (2014). All rights reserved.

Allen, N.J., & Meyer, J.P. (1990). The measurement and antecedents of affective, continuance and normative commitment to the organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology, 63*, 1-18.

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. http://www.Ejbss.Com/Recent.Aspx

Andaleeb, S.S., & Conway, C. (2006). Customer satisfaction in the restaurant industry: An examination of the transaction-specific model. *Journal of Services Marketing, 20*(1), 3-11.

Aquino, K., & Reed, A. (2002). The self-importance of moral identity. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 83*, 1423-1440.

Ardelt M. (1997). Wisdom and life satisfaction in old age. *Journals of Gerontology, Series B: Psychological Sciences and Social Sciences, 52*, 15–27.

Ardelt M. (2000). Antecedents and effects of wisdom in old age: A longitudinal perspective on aging well. *Research on Aging, 22*, 360–394.

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. *Experimental Aging Research, 37*, 241–255. doi: 10.1080/0361073X.2011.554509

Aristotle. (1999). *The Nicomachean ethics*. (W. D. Ross, Trans.). Ontario, Canada: Batoche Books. (Original work published 250 B.C.).

Arjoon, S. (2010). Aristotelian-Thomistic virtue ethics, emotional intelligence and decision-making. *Advances in Management, 3*(4): 7-13.

Arlin, P.K. (1990). Wisdom: The art of problem finding. In R.J. Sternberg (Ed.), *Wisdom: Its nature, origins, and development*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Armstrong, C. (2012). *Global distributive justice: An introduction*. Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press.

Atkins, P.W.B., & Parker, S.K. (2012). Understanding individual compassion in organizations: The role of appraisals and psychological flexibility. *Academy of Management Review, 37*(4), 524–546.

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. (2003). Positive and negative emotions in organizations. In K.S. Cameron, J.E. Dutton, and R.E. Quinn (Eds.), *Positive organizational scholarship* (176–193). San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

Bagozzi, R.P., Belschak, F., Verbeke, W. (2010). The role of emotional wisdom in salespersons' relationships with colleagues and customers. *Psychology & Marketing, 27*(11): 1001–1031. doi: 10.1002/mar.20370

Baird, L., & Griffin, D. (2006). Adaptability and responsiveness: The case for dynamic learning. *Organizational Dynamics, 35*(4), 372-383.

Baker, W.E., & Dutton, J.E. (2007). Enabling positive social capital in organizations. In J.E. Dutton and B.R. Ragins (Eds.), *Exploring positive relationships at work* (246–325). Mahwah, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

Baker, T. L., T. G. Hunt, T.G., & Andrews, M.C. (2006). Promoting ethical behavior and organizational citizenship behaviors: The influence of corporate ethical values. *Journal of Business Research, 59*, 849–857.

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. & Staudinger, U.M. (2000). Wisdom: A metaheuristic (pragmatic) to orchestrate mind and virtue toward excellence. *American Psychologist, 55*, 122–36.

Baltes, P.B., & Smith, J. (2008). The fascination of wisdom: Its nature, ontogeny, and function. *Perspectives on Psychological Science, 3*(1), 56-64.

Balliett, T., and Kelloway, E.K. (2011). Virtuous leaders: Assessing character strengths in the workplace. *Canadian Journal of Administrative Sciences, 28*, 270–283.

Bangen, K.J., Meeks, T.W., & Jeste, D.V. (2013). Defining and assessing wisdom: A review of the literature. *American Journal of Geriatric Psychiatry, 21*(12), 1254–1266. doi:10.1016/j.jagp.2012.11.020

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).

Becker, G. S. (1971). *The economics of discrimination*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Becker, H.S. (1960). Notes on the concept of commitment. *American Journal of Sociology, 66*, 32-42.

Bergami, M., & Bagozzi, R.P. (2000). Self-categorization, affective commitment, and group self-esteem as distinct aspects of social identity in the organization. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 39*, 555–577.

Bernardes, E.S., & Hanna, M.D. (2009). A theoretical review of flexibility, agility and responsiveness in the operations management literature: Toward a conceptual definition of customer responsiveness. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, *29*(1), 30-53.

Bies, R.J., & Moag, J.S. (1986) Interactional justice: Communication criteria for fairness. In B. Sheppard (Ed.), *Research on negotiation in organizations*, *1,* 43–55. Greenwich, CT, JAI Press.

Blau, P. M. (1964). *Exchange and power in social life*. New York: John Wiley.

Boyatzis, R. (1982). *The competent manager.* New York: Wiley.

Boonyarit, I., Chuawanleeb, W., Macaskillc, A., & Numchai, S. (2013). A psychometric analysis of the workplace forgiveness scale. *Europe's Journal of Psychology, 9*(2), 319–338. doi:10.5964/ejop.v9i2.551

Bright, D., Cameron, K., & Caza, A. (2006). The amplifying and buffering effects of virtuousness in downsized organizations. *Journal of Business Ethics, 64*, 249–269.

Bright, D.S., Winn, B.A., & Kanov, J. (2013). Reconsidering virtue: Differences of perspective in virtue ethics and the positive social sciences. *Journal of Business Ethics, 119*, 445–460.

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.

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. (2003). OV and Performance. In K.S. Cameron, J.E. Dutton & R.E. Quinn (Eds.), *Positive organizational scholarship* (48-656). San Francisco, CA: Berrett-Koehler.

Cameron, K.S., Bright, D., & Caza, A. (2004). Exploring the relationships between OV and performance. *American Behavioral Scientist, 47*(6), 766–790.

Cameron, K., & Caza, A. (2002). Organizational and leadership virtues and the role of forgiveness. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies, 9*(1), 33-48. doi:10.1177/107179190200900103

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, 1* (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.

Chandler, M. J., & Holliday, S. (1990). Wisdom in a post apocalyptic age. In R.J. Sternberg (Ed.), *Wisdom: Its nature, origins, and development* (121-141). Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

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*. London, UK: NESTA.

Chun, R. (2005). Ethical character and virtue of organizations: an empirical assessment and strategic implications. *Journal of Business Ethics, 57*, 269-84.

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. *Archives of General 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*(3), 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.

Coyle-Shapiro, J. (2002). A psychological perspective on organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior, 23*(8), 927–946.

Covin, J.G., & Slevin, D.P. (1989). Strategic management of small firms in hostile and benign environments. *Strategic Management Journal, 10*, 75–87.

Cook, J. & Wall, T.D. (1980). New work attitude measures of trust, organizational commitment and personal need non-fulfilment. *Journal of Occupational Psychology, 53*, pp. 39-52.

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.

de Charms, R. (1968). *Personal causation: The internal affective determinants of behavior*. New York: Academic Press.

de Boer, B.J., van Hooft, E., & Bakker, A. (2015). Self-control at work: its relationship with contextual performance. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 30*(4), 406 – 421.

de Jong, J., & Den Hartog, D. (2008). *Innovative work behavior: Measurement and validation*. Scales Research Reports H200820, EIM Business and Policy Research.

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., & Soeters, J. (2013) Drivers of organizational responsiveness: Experiences of a military crisis response organization. *Journal of Organization Design, 2*(2), 1-14. doi:10.7146/jod.7850

Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York: Plenum Publishing Co.

Dietz, G., & Den Hartog, D.N. (2006). Measuring trust inside organizations. *Personnel Review, 35*(5), 557-588.

Dittmann-Kohli, F., & Baltes, P.B. (1990). Toward a neofunctionalist conception of adult intellectual development: Wisdom as a prototypical case of intellectual growth. In C.N. Alexander and E.J. Langer (Eds.), *Higher stages of human development: Perspectives on adult growth* (54-78). New York: Oxford University Press.

Dutton, J.E., Duberich, J.M., & Harquail, C.V. (1994). Organizational images and member identification. *Administrative Science Quarterly, 39*, 239–263.

Dutton, J.E., Frost, P.J., Worline, M.C., Lilius, J.M., & Kanov, J. (2002). Leading in times of trauma. *Harvard Business Review, 80*(1), 54–61.

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.

Elkins T., Keller, R.T. (2003). Leadership in research and development organizations: A literature review and conceptual framework. *Leadership Quarterly, 14*, 587–606.

Elovainio, M., Kivimaki, M., & Vahtera, J. (2002). Organizational justice: Evidence of a new psychosocial predictor of health. *American Journal of Public Health, 92*, 105-108. http://dx.doi.org/10.2105/AJPH.92.1.105

Enterprise Uganda. (2012). *Report on the analysis of selected value chains in the tourism sector*. Unpublished Draft Report, January 2012.

Schulte, E.M., Lehmann-Willenbrock, N., & Kauffeld, S. (2013). Age, forgiveness, and meeting behavior: A multilevel study. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 28*(7/8), 928 – 949.

Evans, P. (1999). HRM on the edge: A duality perspective. *Organization, 6*(2), 325-338.

Evans, A.M., & Revelle, W. (2008). Survey and behavioral measurements of interpersonal trust. *Journal of Research in Personality, 42*, 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.

Fan, J.P., Guan, F., Li, Z. & Yang, Y.G. (2014). Relationship networks and earningsinformativeness: Evidence from corruption cases. *Journal of Business Finance & Accounting*, 1-36.

Fatt, C.K., Knin, E.W., & 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.

Flynn, G. (2007). The virtuous manager: a vision for leadership in business. *Journal ofBusiness Ethics*, *78*, 359-72.

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*, 103-8.

Gabris, GT., 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.

Goleman, D., Boyatzis, R., & McKee, A. (2002). *Primal leadership: Realizing the power of emotional intelligence*. Boston, MA: Harvard Business School.

Gotsis, G., & Grimani, K. (2015). Virtue theory and organizational behavior: An integrative framework. *Journal of Management Development, 34*(10), 1288 – 1309.

Government of Uganda. (2010). *The national development plan, 2010/11-2014/15: Growth, employment and prosperity for socio-economic transformation*. Kampala, Uganda: National Planning Authority.

Gowri, A. (2007). On corporate virtue. *Journal of Business Ethics, 70,* 391–400.

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.

Hatfield, E., Cacioppo, J. T., & Rapson, R. L. (1994). *Emotional contagion*. Cambridge, England: Cambridge University Press.

Haws, K.L., Bearden, W.O., Nenkov, G.Y. (2012). Consumer spending self-control effectiveness and outcome elaboration prompts. *Journal of the Academy of Marketing Science, 40*(5), 695-710.

Hays, J. M. (2008). *Dynamics of organizational wisdom*. Canberra, AU: ANU Research Publications. https://openresearch-repository.anu.edu.au/handle/1885/47985

Homans, G. C. (1961). *Social behavior: Its elementary forms*. New York: Harcourt Brace.

Howell J.M., & Higgins, C.A. (1990). Champions of technological innovation. *Administrative Science Quarterly; 35*, 317–41.

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., Ketchen, D.J., & Slater, S.F. (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*, pp. 58-65.

Isen, A.M., & Baron, R. (1991). Positive affect as a factor in organizational behavior. In L.L. Cummings & B.W. Staw (Eds.), *Research in organizational behavior, Vol. 13* (1–53). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Langabeer, J.R., & DelliFraine, J. (2011). Does CEO optimism affect strategic process? *Management Research Review, 34*(8), 857 – 868.

Jarzabkowski, P., Lê, J., & Van De Ven, A. (2013). Responding to competing strategic demands: How organizing, belonging, and performing paradoxes coevolve. *Strategic Organization, 0*(0), 1-36.

Jason, L.A., Reichler, A., King, C., Madsen, D., Camacho, J., & Marchese, W. (2001). The measurement of wisdom: A preliminary effort. *Journal of Community Psychology, 29*(5), 585-598.

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.

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.

Jeste, D.V., & Vahia, I.V. (2008). Comparison of the conceptualization of wisdom in ancient Indian literature with modern views: Focus on the Bhagavad Gita. *Psychiatry, 71*(3), 197-209.

Joireman, J., Gre´goire, Y., & Tripp, T.M. (2016). Customer forgiveness following service failures. *Current Opinion in Psychology, 10*, 76–82. doi:10.1016/j.copsyc.2015.11.005.

Kahneman, D., & Tversky, A. (1979). Prospect theory: An analysis of decision under risk. *Econometrica, 47*(2), 263–92.

Kasaija, M. (2015). *Budget speech for financial year 2015/16*. Kampala, Uganda: Office of the Minister of Finance, Planning and Economic Development.

Kappes, A., & Tali, S. (2015). *Optimism and entrepreneurship, a double-edged sword*. London, UK: NESTA.

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.

Kimball, M.S. (1990). Precautionary savings in the small and in the large. *Econometrica, 58*, 53–73.

Kimball, M.S. (1992). Precautionary motives for holding assets. In P. Newman, M. Milgate, & J. Eatwell, *The New Palgrave Dictionary of Money and Finance* (158-161). New York: Stockton Press.

Kohli, A., Jaworski, B., & Kumar, A. (1993). MARKOR: A Measure of market orientation. *Journal of Marketing Research, 30*, 467-77.

Kotler, P., & Lee, N. (2005). *Corporate social responsibility: Doing the most good for your company and cause.* New York: John Wiley and Sons.

Kurzynski, M.J. (1998). The virtue of forgiveness as a human resource management strategy. *Journal of Business Ethics, 17*, 77-85.

Kramer, R.M. (1999). Trust and distrust in organizations: Emerging perspectives, enduring questions. *Annual Review of Psychology, 50*(1), 569-598.

Lampman, J. (2005, Oct 3). Trend-watcher sees moral transformation of capitalism. *Christian Science Monitor*.

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).

Levenson, M.R., Jennings, P.A., Aldwin, C.A., & Shiraishi, R.W. (2005). Self-transcendence: Conceptualization and measurement. *The International Journal of Aging And Human Development, 60*(2), 127-143.

Letzring, T.D., Block, J., & Funder, D.C. (2005). Ego-control and ego-resiliency:

Generalization of self-report scales based on personality descriptions from acquaintances, clinicians, and the self. *Journal of Research in Personality, 39*(4), 395-422.

Lilius, J.M., Kanov, J., Dutton, J.E., Worline, M.C., & Maitlis, S. (2011). Compassion revealed: What we know about compassion at work (and where we need to know more). In K. Cameron and G. Spreitzer (Eds.), *Handbook of positive organizational scholarship* (1–43). New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Lonely Planet. (2011). *Lonely Planet's best in travel: Top 10 countries for 2012*. http://www.lonelyplanet.com/europe/travel-tips-and-articles/76856

Luoma, J.B., & Platt, M.J. (2015). Shame, self-criticism, self-stigma, and compassion in acceptance and commitment therapy. *Current Opinion in Psychology, 2*, 97–101.

Deutsch, L. (2009). Are you a trusted leader? *Industrial and Commercial Training, 41*(7), 377 – 381.

MacBeth, A., & Gumley, A. (2012). Exploring compassion: A metaanalysis of the association between self-compassion and psychopathology. *Clinical Psychology Review, 32*(6), 545-552.

MacIntyre, A. (1985). *After virtue: A study in moral theory* (2nd ed.). London, England: Duckworth.

Malik, M., Nawab, S., Naeem, B., & Danish, R. (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*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago.

March, J.G., & Shapira, Z. (1987). Managerial perspectives on risk and risk taking. *Management Science, 33*(11), 1404–18.

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., & Schoorman, F.D. (1995). An integrative model of organizational trust. *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, Canada.

McAllister, D.J. (1995). Affect- and cognition-based trust as foundations for interpersonal co-operation in organisations. *Academy of Management Journal, 38*(1), 24-59.

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* (1-14). New York: The Guilford Press.

Meacham, J.A. (1990). The loss of wisdom. In R.J. Sternberg (Ed.), *Wisdom: Its nature, origins, and development* (181-211). Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press. Tschannen-Moran, M., Bankole, R., Mitchell, R., & Moore, Jr., D. (2013). Student academic optimism: A confirmatory factor analysis. *Journal of Educational Administration, 51*(2), 150 – 175.

Mei, M.Q. (2012). *Customer orientation and organizational responsiveness*. Paper presented at the Druid Academy 2012, University of Cambridge.

Meeks, T., & Jeste, D.V. (2009). Neurobiology of wisdom: A literature overview. *Archives of General Psychiatry, 66*(4), 355-65. doi: 10.1001/archgenpsychiatry.2009.8.

Mele, D. (2009). Integrating personalism into virtue-based business ethics: The personalist and the common good principles. *Journal of Business Ethics, 88*, 227-244.

Mello, J. (2011*). Strategic human resource management* (3rd ed.). Mason, OH: South-western Cengage Learning.

Merriam-Webster Online Dictionary. (2009). www.merriam-websterdictionary

Merriam-Webster, Inc. (1996). *Merriam-Webster's collegiate dictionary* (10th ed.). Springfield, MA: Merriam-Webster.

Meyer, J.P., & Allen, N.J. (1984). Testing the "side-bet theory" of organizational commitment: Some methodological considerations. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 69*(3).

Miller, K. (2007). Compassionate communication in the workplace: Exploring processes of noticing, connecting, and responding. *Journal of Applied Communication Research*, *35*, 223-245.

Minazzi, R. (2010). Hotel classification systems: a comparison of international case studies. *Economica*, *9*(4), 64-86.

Ministry of Tourism, Wildlife, and Heritage. (2012). *Repositioning the tourism sector: For accelerated transformation of Ugandan society*. Unpublished report, Kampala, Uganda.

Laeequddin, M., & Sardana, G. (2010). What breaks trust in customer supplier relationship? *Management Decision, 48*(3), 353–365.

Morrison, R. F., & Hall, D. T. (2002). Career adaptability. In D. T. Hall (Ed.), *Careers in and out of organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Moon, T., Hur, W., Ko, S., Kim, J., & Yoon, S. (2015). Positive work-related identity as a mediator of the relationship between compassion at work and employee outcomes. *Human Factors and Ergonomics in Manufacturing & Service Industries*, *26*(1), 84-94.

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. 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.

Mwaura, F., & Ssekitoleko, S. (2012). Reviewing Uganda's tourism sector for economic and social upgrading. *Economic Policy Research Centre (EPRC) Research Series No. 91*.

Nabatchi, T., Bingham, L.B., & Good, D.H. (2007). Organizational justice and workplace mediation: A six factor model. *International Journal of Conflict Management, 18*(2): 148-176.

Narver, J.C., & Slater, S.F. (1990) The effect of a market orientation on business profitability. *Journal of Marketing, 54*(4), 20–35.

Nepean, W. (2007). Virtuous firms perform better: An empirical investigation of organizational virtues and performance. *Business Post Comment*.

Netemeyer, R.G., Bearden, W.O., & Sharma, S. (2003). *Scaling procedures for self-report measures in the social sciences: Issues and applications*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Ndubisi, N. O. (2006). A structural equation modeling of the antecedents of relationship quality in the Malaysia banking sector. *Journal of Financial Services Marketing, 11*(2), 131-141.

Neubert, M. J., Carlson, D. S., Kacmar, K. M., Roberts, J. A., & Chonko, L. B. (2009). The virtuous influence of ethical leadership behavior: Evidence from the field. *Journal of Business Ethics*, *90*(2), 157-157-170. doi:10.1007/s10551-009-0037-9

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.

Nikolaou, I. (2003). The development and validation of a measure of generic work competencies. *International Journal of Testing, 3*(4), 309–319.

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*(2), 212–217.

Ogunnaike, O.O., & Kehinde, O.J. (2011). Assessing relationship between personal value and customer satisfaction: Evidence from Nigerian banking industry. *The Annals of The "Ştefan cel Mare" University of Suceava. Fascicle of the Faculty of Economics and Public Administration, 11*(1), 13.

Paliszkiewicz, J., & Koohang, A. (2013). Organizational trust as a foundation for knowledge sharing and its influence on organizational performance. *Online Journal of Applied Knowledge Management, 1*(2).

Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V.A., & Berry, L.L. (1985). conceptual model of service quality and its implications for future research. *Journal of Marketing, 49,* Fall.

Parasuraman, A., Zeithaml, V.A., & Berry, L.L. (1988). SERVQUAL: a multi-item scale for measuring consumer perceptions of service quality. *Journal of Retailing, 64*(1), 12-40.

Perme, C.M. (1993). *Building organizational courage in your company*. Bloomington, MN: Minnesota Ventures Growth Guide.

Peterson, C., & Seligman, M.E.P. (2004). *Character strengths and virtues: A handbook and classification*. Washington, D.C.: American Psychological Association and Oxford University Press.

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.

Piedmont, R. L. (2001). Spiritual transcendence and the scientific study of spirituality. *Journal of Rehabilitation, 67*, 4–14.

Pommier, E. A. (2011). *The compassion scale*. Ann Arbor, MI: Dissertation Abstracts International.

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.

Private Sector Platform for Action. (2010). *A synopsis of key private sector growth challenges and proposals for policy reforms*. Kampala, Uganda: Private Sector Foundation.

Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S.B., Lee, Y., & Podsakoff, N.P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioral research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies.

The Journal of Applied Psychology, *88*, 879–903. doi: 10.1037/0021- 9010.88.5.879.

Pugh, S. D. (2001). Service with a smile: Emotional contagion in the service encounter. *Academy of Management Journal, 44*, 1018–1027.

Quinn, R. P., & Staines, G. L. (1979). *The 1977 quality of employment survey*. Ann Arbor, MI: Institute for Social Research.

Rachman, S. J. (1984). Fear and courage. *Behavior Therapy, 15*, 109–120.

Raes, F., Pommier, E., Neff, K. D., & Van Gucht, D. (2011). Construction and factorial validation of a short form of the self-compassion scale. *Clinical Psychology & Psychotherapy, 18*(3), 250–255.

Rego, A., Neuza, R., & Cunha, M.P. (2010). Perceptions of organizational virtuousness and happiness as predictors of organizational citizenship behaviors. *Journal of Business Ethics, 93*, 215–235.

Rehman–Shams–Ur, 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.

Reynolds, D. J. (2003). *A study of U. S. chief executive officers managerial wisdom.* A dissertation submitted to the faculty of Argosy University for the doctor of business administration. Sarasota, FL: Argosy University.

Riggio, R. E. (2011). Cutting-edge leadership: Four qualities leaders need for success: Four qualities most successful leaders possess. *Psychology Today*. www.psychologytoday.com/blog/cutting-edge-leadership/201102/four-qualities-leaders-need-success

Daft, R., & Lengel, R. (1998). *Fusion leadership: Unlocking the subtle forces that change people and organizations*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.

Robinson, S.L. (1996) Trust and breach of the psychological contract. *AdministrativeScience Quarterly, 41*, 574-99.

Rosenbaum, M. (1980). A schedule for assessing self-control behaviors: preliminary findings. *Behavior Therapy, 11*(1), 109-121.

Rupp, D.E. (2011). n 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 Chang, E.C. (Ed.). *Optimism and pessimism: Implications for theory, research, and practice*. Washington, DC: American Psychological Association.

Schweizer, K., Rauch, W., & Gold, A. (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. In Ritzer, G. (Ed.). *Encyclopedia of Social Theory*, 408-414. 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.

Seckinger, J., Langerak, B., Mishra, J. & Mishra, B. (2010). Optimism and longevity. *Advances in Management, 3*(3), 32–39.

Sen, S., & Pekerti, A. (2010). Servant leadership as antecedent of trust in Organizations. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal, 31*(7), 643 – 663.

Schmit, D.E., Muldoon, J., & Pounders, K. (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.

Shalley, C.E., Zhou, J., & Oldham, G.R. (2004). The effects of personal and contextual characteristics on creativity: where should we go from here? *Journal of Management, 30*(6):933–58.

Sharot, T. (2012). *The optimism bias: Why we're wired to look on the bright side*. London: Constable & Robinson.

Sharot, T., Guitart-Masip, M., Korn, C. W., Chowdhury, R., & Dolan, R. J. (2012). How dopamine enhances an optimism bias in humans. *Current Biology, 22*, 1477-1481.

Sharot, T., Kanai, R., Marston, D., Korn, C. W., Rees, G., & Dolan, R. J. (2012). Selectively altering belief formation in the human brain. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America, 109*, 17058-17062.

Sharot, T., Korn, C. W., & Dolan, R. J. (2011). How unrealistic optimism is maintained in the face of reality. *Nature Neuroscience, 14*, 1475-1479.

Shekari Hamideh. (2014). Can organizational virtuousness promote employees' citizenship behaviors in organizations? *International Journal of Management and Humanity Sciences, S*(4), 4164-4172.

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., McConnell, S., Chochinov, H., Hack, T., Hagen, N., McClement, S., & Raffin Bouchal, S. (2016). Compassion: a scoping review of the healthcare literature. *BMC Palliative Care 15*(6).

TNS Opinion & Social. (2014). *Special Eurobarometer 397: Corruption*. European Commission. 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 Alex, & Mercy Mpinganjira. (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.

Sparrow, P. R. (1997). Organizational competencies: Creating a strategic behavioral framework for selection and assessment. In N. Anderson & P. Herriot (Eds.), *International handbook of selection and assessment* (pp. 343–368). Chichester, England: Wiley.

Sprecher, S., & Fehr, B. (2005). Compassionate love for close others and humanity. *Journal of Social and Personal Relationships, 22*, 629-651.

Staudinger, U.M., & Gluck, J. (2011). Psychological wisdom research: commonalities and differences in a growing field. *Annual Review of Psychology, 62*, 215–241.

Stamm, B. H. (2002). Measuring compassion satisfaction as well as fatigue: Developmental history of the compassion satisfaction and fatigue test. In Figley, C.R. (Ed.). *Treating compassion fatigue*. New York: Brunner-Routledge.

Staw, B. M., Sutton, R.I., & Pelled, L.H. (1994). Employee positive emotion and favorable outcomes at the workplace. *Organizational Science 5*, 51–71.

Staw, B.M., Sandelands, L.E., & Dutton, J.E. (1981). Threat-rigidity effects in organizational behavior: A multilevel analysis. *Administrative Science Quarterly Science, 26*(4), 501–24.

Steinberg, L. & Cauffman, E. (1996). Maturity of judgment in adolescence: Psychosocial factors in adolescent decision making. *Law and Human Behavior 20*:249–272.

Stephens, J.P., Heaphy, E.D., Carmeli, A., Spreitzer, G.M., & Dutton, J.E. (2013). Relationship quality and virtuousness: Emotional carrying capacity as a source of individual and team resilience. *The Journal of Applied Behavioral Science, 49*(1).

Sternberg, R. J. (1990). *Wisdom: Its nature, origins, and development.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Sternberg, R. J. (1985). Implicit theories of intelligence, creativity and wisdom. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology, 49*(3), 607-627.

Siegel, S.M., & Kaemmerer, W.F. (1978). Measuring the perceived support for innovation in organizations. *Journal of Applied Psychology 63*(5), 553–562.

Strickland, L. H. (1958). Surveillance and trust. *Journal of Personality, 26*, 200-215.

Segerstrom, S.C., Evans, D.R., & Eisenlohr-Moul, T.A. (2010). Optimism and pessimism dimensions in the life orientation test-revised: Method and meaning. *Journal of Research in Personality, 45*, 126–129.

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.A., & 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, A.J. & Torsello, D. (2015). *Exploring the link between organizational culture and corruption*. CEU Business School Working Paper Series.

Taylor, M., Bates, G., & Webster, J. D. (2011). Comparing the psychometric 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). *Experimental Aging Research, 37*, 129–141. doi: 10.1080/0361073X.2011.554508

Terril, A. L., Ruiz, J. M. & Garofalo, J. P. (2010). Look on the bright side: Do the benefits of optimism depend on the social nature of the stress? *Journal of Behavioral Medicine, 33*, 399-414.

The Republic of Uganda. (2010). *National development plan, 2010/11-2014/15*. Kampala, Uganda.

The Republic of Uganda. (2014). *The government annual performance report 2012-2013, Volume 1*. Kampala, Uganda: Department of Monitoring and Evaluation Office of the Prime Minister.

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.

Tiberio, L. (2010). Enhancing workplace communication with language and culture training. *Perdido Magazine*. http://www.perdidomagazine.com/issues/16-2/article-enhancing_workplace.php

Torabipor, A. & Rekab Eslamizadem, S. (2009). Self-evaluation based on EFQM organizational transcendence model in Ahvaz hospitals. *Journal of Health Information Management, 8*(2): 1-9.

Tornstam, L. (1994). Gero-transcendence: A theoretical and empirical exploration. In Thomas, L.E. & Eisenhandler, S.A. (Eds.). *Aging and the religious dimension*. London: Auburn House.

Torpie, K. (2014). Customer service vs. patient care. *Patient Experience Journal, 1*(2). http://pxjournal.org/journal/vol1/iss2/3

Industrial Development Corporation. (2012). *Tourism report: The business hotel industry in select East and West African countries*. Department of Research and Information.

Uganda Bureau of Statistics. (2010). *The urban labour force survey, 2009*. Kampala, Uganda: Uganda Bureau of Statistics.

Uganda Bureau of Statistics. (2011). *2011 sector statistical abstract*. Kampala, Uganda: Ministry of Tourism and Trade.

Uganda Tourism Board. (2011). *Tourism Uganda: Marketing strategy 2011-2016*.

Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and motivation*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass

Walsh J.P., Weber K., & Margolis J.D. (2003). Social issues and management: Our lost cause found. *Journal of Management, 29*, 859–881.

Wang, C. L. & Ahmed, P. K. (2004). The development and validation of the organizational 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. *International Journal of Aging & Human Development, 65*, 163–183. doi: 10.2190/AG.65.2.d

Webb, J.R., Hirsch, J.K., Visser, P.L., & Brewer, K.G. (2013). Forgiveness and health: Assessing the mediating effect of health behavior, social support, and interpersonal functioning.

The Journal of Psychology: Interdisciplinary and Applied, 147(5), 391-414.

Weiner, B. (1974). *Achievement motivation and attribution theory.* Morristown, NJ: General Learning Press

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.

Weiss, B., & Messerli, H. (2012). *Uganda tourism sector situational assessment: Tourism reawakening*. Technical document of the World Bank.

West, M.A. (1987). A measure of role innovation at work. *British Journal of Social Psychology, 6*, 83-85.

White, R. W. (1959). Motivation reconsidered: The concept of competence. *Psychological Review, 66*, 297−333.

White, J.C., Varadarajan, P.R. & Dacin, P.E. (2003). Market situation interpretation and response: The role of cognitive style, organizational culture, and information use. *Journal of Marketing, 67*(3), 63–79.

WTTC. (2012). *Travel & tourism economic impact 2011*. Uganda, WTTC, London.

Wiersbe, W. W. (1989). *The Bible exposition commentary*. Wheaton, IL: Victor Books

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. & Pury, C. (2007). The construct of courage: Categorization and measurement. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 59*, (2), 135–147.

Woodard, C. R. (2004). Hardiness and the concept of courage. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice and Research, 56*, 173–185.

Woodman RW, Sawyer JE, & Griffin, R.W. (1993). Toward a theory of organizational creativity. *Academy of Management Review, 18*(2), 293–321.

Yelena Tsarenko, Y. & Tojib, D. (2011). A transactional model of forgiveness in the service failure context: a customer driven approach. *Journal of Services Marketing, 25*(5), 381 – 392.

Zeithaml, V.A., Bitner, M.J., & Gremler, D.D. (2006). *Services marketing: Integrating customer focus across the firm* (4th ed.). Singapore: McGraw-Hill

Zucker, L.G. (1986). Production of trust: institutional sources of economic structure, 1840-1920. In Staw, B.M. & Cummings, L.L. (Eds), *Research in organisational behavior*, Vol. 8. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Authors' Biographies

Joshua Gukiina, is a Ugandan, who holds a BA (SS) of Makerere University, A PGDHRM of Busoga University, A Master of Human Resource Management of Kampala International University and a PhD in Human Resource Management of Makerere University, Kampala, Uganda. He is a lecturer at the Makerere University Business School, Jinja Campus, Department of Marketing and Management.

Joseph Mpeera Ntayi, of Makerere University Business School is a distinguished international scholar, consultant and practitioner with proven professional record in micro-finance, savings and credit cooperatives, corporate governance, public administration and management. He is the Dean of Faculty of Computing and Management Sciences at Makerere University School of Business, Uganda, and a recipient of the Maastricht School of Management Executive Program award. His list of publications is available at www.ntayi.com.

Waswa Balunywa, of Makerere University Business School is former Dean of Faculty of Commerce and Principal of Makerere University Business School in Uganda.

Augustine Ahiauzu, of Rivers State University of Science and Technology is a Professor of Organizational Behavior and Industrial Relations at the Rivers State University of Science and Technology, Port Harcourt, Nigeria. He also serves as the Chairman of the International Centre for Management Research and Training in Nigeria.