THE DYNAMIC NATURE OF ORGANIZATIONAL COMPASSION: TRANSLATING EMOTION INTO ACTION THROUGH INTEGRATING EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE AND ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE

ABSTRACT

Developing a compassionate organization involves a translation of individual and group level emotions into collective action. By incorporating compassion into organizational culture an organization can create a sustainable context that promotes employee well-being. Our framework indicates how emotional intelligence can direct, guide, and shape emotions at the organizational level to create a compassionate culture. Drawing on extant theoretical frameworks, we argue that compassion requires specific abilities to enable its incorporation at the organizational level.

Keywords: Compassion, emotional intelligence, bounded emotionality, emotional labor, organizational culture

THE DYNAMIC NATURE OF ORGANIZATIONAL COMPASSION: TRANSLATING EMOTION INTO ACTION THROUGH INTEGRATING EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE AND ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE

"The essential difference between emotion and reason is that emotion leads to action while reason leads to conclusions."

Donald B Caine (1999)

Research on emotion in organizations has gained significant momentum since Ashforth and Humphrey (1995) and Fineman (2000) called for more attention to be paid to this field. Most of the research conducted has emphasized emotions at an individual or group level, however (Elfenbein, 2007). Noticeably, one area that has little empirical or theoretical investigation is how emotions emerge at the macro-organizational level. Ashkanasy (2003) provided an organizing framework of emotions in organizations across differing levels using a multilevel model: *within person level; between persons level; level of interpersonal interactions; group level;* and finally, the *organizational level.* At the *organizational level*, Ashkanasy (2003) argues that emotion can be considered one of the artifacts or visible reflections of organizational culture.

Our aim in this article is to provide an overarching framework for incorporating emotions (and specifically compassion) into an organizational culture, based on Schein's (1990) three levels of culture. Consistent with Ashkanasy (2003), we argue in this article that compassion is an appropriate emotion to illustrate how emotional intelligence can be incorporated into organizational culture to benefit organizations and their employees. In this respect, compassion

is a relatively recent construct in organizational research, defined by Boyatzis, Smith, and Blaize (2006) as a humane quality incorporating an awareness and sympathy for the suffering of others and a desire to act on it (see also Dutton, Worline, Frost, & Lilius, 2006; Kanov, Maitlis, Worline, Dutton, Frost, & Lilius, 2004; Lilius, Worline, Maitlis, Kanov, Dutton, & Frost, 2008).

Moreover, compassion is a specific emotion with specific behavioral consequences (Gladkova, 2010; Goetz, Keltner, & Simon-Thomas, 2010; von Dietze & Orb, 2000). Compassion researchers (e.g., Frost, Dutton, Worline, & Wilson, 2000) also note the prevalence of culture when they describe how compassion is shaped and coordinated in organizations: "…whether the social coordination of compassion is activated and mobilized depends on an organization's social architecture and the agency of those in the organization" (Lilius, et al., 2008, pg. 194). Our argument is that Schein's (1990) view of culture, which comprises three levels: (1) artifacts, (2) beliefs and values, and (3) deep assumptions, provides a framework to link emotions at the individual level to organizational culture, thus better enabling organizations to embrace compassion as a core value. We refer to the Mayer and Salovey (1997) "four-branch" model of emotional intelligence (awareness of emotions, emotional knowledge, facilitation of emotions and management of emotions) as the underlying enabling mechanism.

A FRAMEWORK TO LINK EMOTIONS TO CULTURE

The framework we propose is illustrated in Figure 1. In additional to culture and emotional intelligence, we also draw upon theories of affective events (Weis & Cropanzano, 1996), bounded emotionality (Mumby & Putnam, 1992) and emotional labor (Hochschild, 1983). In essence, we propose a model where emotions and compassion are an integral part of an organization and emerge in both the values organizations espouse and the beliefs that underpin those values.

Insert Figure 1 about here

Semantic Considerations

      Culture and climate. At the outset, we want to be clear that organizational *culture* and *climate* convey distinct constructs. Denison (1996) noted that people often confuse the terms, and suggested that climate is "temporal, subjective, and often subject to direct manipulation" while culture, refers to an "evolved context (within which a situation may be embedded)" (p. 624) and therefore is less susceptible to direct manipulation. Consequently, we use *climate* to refer to a more temporally varying state, while *culture* is a more stable, longer-term perspective. In particular, *affective climate* refers to a context-specific, shorter-term temporal construct representative of the contemporaneous 'feel' of a setting or group of people (Ashkanasy & Nicholson, 2003).

      Compassion, empathy, sympathy. In a cross-cultural linguistic analysis of sympathy, compassion, and empathy, Gladkova (2010) distinguished sympathy as an emotion resulting from a cognitive understanding "that something bad has happened to another person" (p. 271). She suggests that compassion is similar to sympathy, but is typically associated with more severe events. Of particular importance she notes that: "compassion implies a more 'active' response to the bad state of another person" (p. 272). Finally, Gladkova (2010) distinguishes empathy by suggesting that it need not even be considered an emotion *per se*, but is a state referring to "a conscious attention to the feelings of another person" (p. 273). Notably, Dutton and colleagues (Dutton et al., 2006; Kanov, et al., 2004; Lilius, et al., 2008) appear to have adopted the distinction between compassion and empathy, particularly, noting similarly that compassion implies action (intended or actual). Goetz and colleagues (2010) discuss compassion, sympathy,

and empathy as being in a related set of emotions, and thus we also take this perspective, noting that literature regarding empathy and sympathy can inform understanding about compassion.

INTEGRATING ORGANIZATIONAL CULTURE AND EMOTIONAL INTELLIGENCE

At the core of our model (Figure 1) is an integration of the four "branches" of emotional intelligence (Mayer & Salovey, 1997) with the three-level model of culture proposed by Schein (1990). Various researchers have proposed that emotions and emotional intelligence can be incorporated into a cultural framework (Cherniss, 2001; Jordan, 2004; Mumby & Putnam, 1992). According to Schein's (1990) framework, an organization's culture springs at its deepest levels from assumptions its managers and members hold to be unquestionably true (e.g., compassion is an appropriate and necessary response set for employees to be able to exhibit). These implicit assumptions then lead to a statement of values held in high esteem (e.g., compassion forms the very foundation of who we claim to be as a company) that are stated explicitly in corporate planning documents, but also implicitly encouraged. This is the middle level of Schein's model. Further, these assumptions and values impact organizational goals and indicate where an organization is likely to concentrate energy. Finally, these values and assumptions emerge at the surface level in organizations as artifacts (visible manifestations) that demonstrate the importance of these values.

The model of emotional intelligence as outlined by Mayer and Salovey (1997) comprises four "branches," or basic abilities: (1) emotional awareness (the ability to perceive one's own and others emotional states); (2) emotional knowledge (knowledge about emotions and the behaviors that emerge from emotions); (3) emotional facilitation (the ability to use emotions to enhance performance by linking emotion to cognition); and (d) emotional management (the

ability to display and regulate emotional expression). This model emphasizes that emotional intelligence is a multi-dimensional construct and that these four steps are iterative in that each of the abilities can contribute to enhancing other abilities. Joseph and Newman(2010) recently found support for the idea that the four branches are hierarchical, what they termed the "cascading model" of EI…"in which emotion perceptions must causally precede emotion understanding, which in turn precedes conscious emotion regulation and job performance" (2010, p. 54). For instance, in reflecting on reactions in a crisis situation, an individual's emotional self-awareness (emotion awareness) can contribute to a better understanding of the emotions involved and the behaviors that can emerge from those emotions (emotional knowledge), which can then enable that person in future situations to link how they are thinking to an emotional response set (emotional facilitation) and to respond in a more compassionate way the next time such as crisis emerges (emotional management).

Huy (1999) proposed a theoretical model in which emotional intelligence at the individual level has an impact on what he terms the emotional capability of the organization to deal with organizational change. We broaden this model to include the organization's emotional capacity to respond compassionately to its employees dealing with the change. Thus, for an organization to be compassionate, it must *ipso facto* reflect and integrate compassionate values and abilities at all levels of culture.

We note in particular that the notion of *empathy* serves to link emotional intelligence and compassion. In fact, emotional empathy is significantly relevant to three of the four EI branches: Branch 1 – as reading another's feelings; Branch 3- as understanding another's feelings; and Branch 4 – as expressing some caring to a person. Furthermore, in the core text that established the psychometric properties on the Revised Ability Emotional Intelligence Test (Mayer, Salovey,

Caruso, Emotional Intelligence Test, or MSCEIT), Mayer, Salovey, and Caruso (1999) include a measure of emotional empathy in their validation studies and showed it to be related to most of their tasks and branches.

Thus, for an organization to incorporate the four emotional intelligence abilities with compassion as a goal, it would need to develop consistent beliefs, values, and artifacts. Thus, in terms of emotional awareness, members would need to believe that emotions are a form of capital in an organization that enable displays of compassion toward employees and clients. Moreover, the organization would need also to establish values consistent with the idea that being aware of and perceiving emotions accurately is critical for all levels in the organization. At the artifact level, awareness of emotions should enable employees to become aware of being compassionate in their decision making. With respect to emotional knowledge, a belief should emerge that knowledge of the basis of emotions, will help the organization to function effectively. The organization would also need to develop values around an understanding of the emotional consequences of decisions, which would emerge as artifacts and observable patterns of behavior consistent with the concept of a compassionate organization.

Referring to emotional facilitation, the underlying belief of such an organization would come to be that positive and negative emotions have utility that can be engaged to assist in task completion. Moreover, the values that emerge from this are that it is acceptable and effective to use emotions to enhance work. Finally, in terms of managing emotions within the organization effectively, there would be an underlying belief that encouraging emotions will lead to a unified perception of an organization as being compassionate, that there is a value to employees and the organization in displaying compassion, and at an artifact level, that making compassionate decisions will positively impact organizational effectiveness and profitability.

To support these arguments, in the next section we review relevant theories of emotions in organizational contexts, and then proceed with a detailed outline for the specific integration of these with implications for developing compassion in organizations.

Theories of Emotions in Organizational Contexts

Rafaeli and Sutton's (1987) article on expression of emotion as part of the work role was one of the first substantial academic works to underscore the importance of the link between emotions and emotional abilities to the workplace. Within their model of emotional labor, the sources of role expectations incorporated a dimension called "organizational context," which included artifacts of organizational culture manifested through recruitment and selection, socialization, and reward/punishment contingencies. Rafaeli and Sutton argued that an organization sets up its employees' expectations for the emotional expressions necessary for successful job performance. In our framework, we argue that the use of emotional intelligence abilities and compassion provides the theoretical and practical first step for organizations to incorporate emotion. Next, we outline the specific theoretical foundations for our framework – affective events theory, bounded emotionality, and the theory of emotion labor.

Affective events theory. In our framework, we consider the work environment, as represented by its culture and climate, as being critical to an establishment of compassion as an emotional-behavioral response set chosen frequently by organizational members. This is consistent with the logic of Affective Events Theory (AET: Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996), which places emphasis on the work environment as the source of "affective events." These events then determine employees' emotional reactions to the events, which then impact attitudes and drive behavioral outcomes.

Lilius and colleagues (2008) used an AET framework to examine compassion in organizations. They found that instances of compassion are salient emotional events which lead to an increase in positive emotion, reduction of negative emotion, triggering of sense-making, and stronger affective commitment. These authors' findings suggest that affective events in the form of compassion have both immediate positive emotional outcomes, and also that these events can aggregate over time to have long-lasting positive effects on employees. Indeed, Lilius et al. directly argue for research examining "the influence of occupational and organizational culture in the enactment of compassion at work" (p. 201).

We frame these findings within our emotional intelligence-culture linkage: Colleagues and supervisors who are adept enough to recognize an emotional need for compassion (perceiving emotions), and then act in a compassionate way (utilizing emotions) to provide positive affective events for their fellow co-workers (managing emotions). These individual events then aggregate over time, forming an affective *climate* of compassion. Moreover, if maintained and strengthened over time, this climate can then solidify into an organizational *culture* of compassion.

Bounded emotionality. Mumby and Putnam (1992) introduced the concept of bounded emotionality, noting that the expression and control of emotions in organizations is a fundamental part of organizational life. Bounded emotionality focuses on the appropriate expression and suppression of emotion to maintain quality relationships in organizations. Bounded emotionality can also be linked to compassion with its concomitant emphasis on nurturing, caring, and supportiveness.

Within a bounded emotionality framework, employees are encouraged to maintain sensitive, but flexible, boundaries between what is felt and what is expressed (Martin et al.,

1998) and to adapt this style to the dominant organizational values. This notion mirrors the compassionate flexibility – or the skill to demonstrate a variety of compassionate responses as called for by the situation – that Lilius and colleagues (2008) regard as critical: these authors suggest that "skillful impromptu caring that colleagues do in response to pain" (pg. 212) can contribute to beneficial relationships between individuals in the organization, and between employees, clients, and the organization. The value set within the organization is therefore geared towards enhancing relationships. As Lilius et al. emphasize, compassion shown by peers in the workplace "can strengthen emotional connections at work …" (p. 194).

Martin, Knopoff, and Beckman (1998) used a bounded emotionality framework to examine performance within an organizational setting, The Body Shop. Martin and her associates selected this organization arguing that there was an "endorsed ideology that supported a subset of elements of bounded emotionality" (p. 239). We argue that this shows how bounded emotionality can emerge as an artifact at the organizational level identifiable by outsiders.

We extend Martin and colleagues' (1998) arguments and suggest that bounded emotionality can be used as a guiding paradigm to set an affective climate at the organizational level. To illustrate, we use compassion and enthusiasm. The establishment of a value-set of encouraging positive emotions such as enthusiasm and compassionate responses may result in positive emotional contagion (Barsade, 2002; Hatfield, Cacioppo, & Rapson, 1993) across workers (we note that compassion researchers have already argued this; see, for example, Kanov, et al., 2004). The purpose of establishing this value set is not just about making workers happy or making them feel better, but on using emotion to enhance worker satisfaction, well-being, commitment, productivity, and collaboration (Lilius, et al., 2008).

Using Schein's (1990) framework to explain this process, the executives of an organization would need to have or form a belief that positive emotions will enhance productivity (Linley, Joseph, Harrington, & Wood, 2006) and compassion is necessary to affectively bind employees to the organization (Lilius, et al., 2008). Next, based on these beliefs, organizational decision-makers develop a set of values that can emerge in their corporate planning documents that promote a positive, compassionate environment for employees and/or their customers. Finally, at an artifact level, there are behavioral expectations or norms developed where employees are expected to be positive and compassionate within the work context.

Alternatively, some emotions may also need to be controlled, or bounded, to ensure that working relationships are maintained. Following the development of a set of beliefs that uncontrolled anger in the workplace can have a negative impact on relationships (Fitness, 2000), a value statement can emerge that results in a norm of not accepting angry outbursts from either employees or clients/customers. Decisions on the type of emotions that are encouraged or discouraged by culture emerge from value statements made within that organization.

Emotional labor. The concept of emotional labor was first introduced by Hochschild (1983) following her intensive study of flight attendants and debt collectors. Hochschild concluded that there was utility for organizations maintaining contextually appropriate displays of emotion that enhance their business. In this context, organizationally prescribed display rules are an artifact that demonstrates the values the organization finds important. The concept of emotional display rules as constituents of organizational culture was further expanded by Rafaeli & Sutton (1987), van Maanen and Kunda (1989), Beyer and Niño (2001) and Fineman (2001). From these authors' perspective, organizational requirements for employees to display particular

emotional expressions as a condition of remuneration can become an onerous imposition. van Maanen's graphic description (in van Maanen and Kunda, 1989) of his inglorious expulsion from Disneyland for failing to follow this "fun" organization's employee display rules is a case in point: such strong display rules can create great dissonance for employees. We argue that by intelligently incorporating compassion - towards employees as well as customers - into the value set of organizations, that there may be fewer deleterious consequences for both the employees (Lilius, et al., 2008) and the organization, of meeting the display rules.

Several authors (e.g., Fineman, 2001; Grandey, 2003; Rafaeli & Sutton, 1987) have extended Hochschild's (1983) view on emotional display rules to make the case that emotional display rules often serve as organizationally prescribed requirements designed to achieve organizational goals though standardization of expression. More recently, Diefendorff and Richard (2003) reported that display rules perceptions at work predict job attitudes, performance, and personal health outcomes (see also, Morehart, and Gabriel, 2010; Grandey, 2003; Schaubroeck & Jones, 2000). These display results are often communicated by supervisors (Diefendorff, Richard, & Croyle, 2006). Organizations which require their employees strictly to conform to specific display rules may be evidence an uncompassionate culture (particularly towards their employees).

In the context of the present article, the question remains as to how emotional labor contributes to the compassionate organization. Goetz and colleagues (2010), in a review of compassion as a form of affect that facilitates cooperation, concluded that there is little evidence that people can distinguish the facial display of compassion from basic emotions such as sadness, unless combined with other expressions of affect such as touch and voice. Related, Newcombe and Ashkanasy (2002) demonstrated this in an experimental study that subordinates' perceptions

of their leader were negatively impacted when the leader's expression was incongruent with the leader's message, especially in the instance of positive feedback accompanied by a negative expression. Thus, to facilitate compassionate responses and a compassionate climate across employees, leaders and managers in particular need to understand that simply verbalizing what they feel is a compassionate response, if not matched with some sort of action (e.g., bodily action through a hug, or material help, through offering some sort of assistance), is likely to be counterproductive.

In summary, emotional labor involves display of an emotional expression as required by the organization's emotional display rules. We emphasize that such rules can also govern emotional displays in intra-organizational settings, especially between supervisor/leaders and their subordinates, or "leading with emotional labor." Then, through processes of emotional contagion, this is reflected throughout the organization. It would follow from this that an organization that aims to be compassionate, both towards its customers/clients and to its employees, will need to develop emotional display rules consistent with this objective.

SPECIFIC MODEL LINKAGES

Assumptions Level of Culture

Schein (1990) argues that underlying assumptions grow out of values that are repeatedly stated within an organization until they are taken for granted and become unspoken assumptions. McGregor (1960) argues that when employees are treated consistently, they eventually behave in concert with the assumptions upon which that behavior is based in order to make their world stable and predictable. Basic assumptions evolve as solutions to a problem that is repeated frequently. Thus, organizations which have compassion as a basic assumption in their *raison*

d'etre, would insist employees treat both each other and clients/customers with compassion. Over time, these assumptions and values would be taken for granted and would be the "*modus operandi*" for employees.

Assumptions and emotional awareness. Emotional awareness refers to being aware of emotional experiences and expressing emotions and emotional needs accurately (Mayer & Salovey, 1997). This first facet of emotional intelligence can be specifically linked to culture through a bounded emotionality framework. At the employee level, emotional awareness allows for the early recognition of the onset of an emotion so one can make a decision as to how and when to control that emotion (Mischel & DeSmet, 2000). At an organizational level, emotional awareness can be used to determine the dominant affective climate of the organization. Without this basic awareness of the current emotions that drive behavior in the organization, it is difficult to be proactive encouraging emotions and behaviors such as compassion. In an organization, this might emerge as an explicit or implicit norm of emotional awareness to promote appropriate emotions to sustain performance. Lilius and colleagues (2008) discuss data that supports the link between performance and the appropriate expression of compassion. Some employees reported that being a recipient of compassion enabled them to continue to perform their jobs effectively, whereas others noted that a lack of it prevented them from performing effectively. Indeed, the lack of compassion led to a desire to quit in some of the more extreme examples.

One basic assumption that organizations can base their values on is that emotions, and especially compassion, are essential drivers of behaviors and perceptions both within and outside of organizations (Weiss & Cropanzano, 1996). It follows therefore that emotional climate is influenced by employees' state and trait affect (see also Barsade, 2002). Thus, a basic belief that might arise from a value of accurate perception of emotions is that constant monitoring of the

emotional climate of the organization constitutes a form of best practice. In this respect, Vandenabeele (2009 showed that monitoring the level of compassion in an organization is a precursor to affective commitment.

Assumptions and emotional knowledge. Emotional knowledge refers to the importance of understanding emotional progressions (e.g., from less intense to more intense) and cycles (e.g., a grief cycle). At the assumption level of culture, organizations would assume that gaining knowledge about emotions and the impact it has on the organization and its employees is important. Thus, through emotional knowledge, organizational members come to understand the appropriate uses and outcomes of compassion. For instance, in some circumstances (e.g., death of a loved one; see Lilius, et al., 2008), organizations can encourage employees to understand the importance of providing support through compassionate responses to help affected employees.

Huy (1999) suggested further that change is a workplace event requiring emotional understanding. In this instance, organizations that use emotional knowledge effectively should come to understand the inherently emotional nature of organizational change that, as Huy argued, can spiral out of control if not caught early. This has been referred to as emotional hijacking, a situation where specific emotions dominate the cognitive processes which has also been linked to "emotional contagion spirals" (Hareli & Rafaeli, 2008).

Knowledge of the types of emotions employees are most likely to experience at work is valuable because this knowledge enables organizations to prepare employees so that events don't produce a fight/flight response (Cannon, 1932). To deal with emotional situations compassionately and successfully in the workplace (e.g., such as those engendered during organizational change), organizations also need to know the affective events that trigger strong emotional responses (Huy, 2002). Clearly, while both are critical, there is a difference between

knowing the types of emotions that might be experienced at work and *understanding* the

potential behaviors and reactions that can emerge from those emotions. Thus, understanding the

implications of both negative and positive emotional climates is critical for organizations to

promote effective compassionate responses.

Assumptions and emotional utilization. Emotional utilization refers to the use of

emotions to prioritize thinking by focusing on important information that explains employees'

emotional feelings. This factor also encourages the development of multiple perspectives to

assess problems, including pessimistic and optimistic perspectives (Mayer & Salovey, 1997). At

the assumption level, emotional use and facilitation may be used to set the right affective climate

for activities such as creative and brainstorming which benefit more from positive moods.

Setting the right affective climate could also entail a core assumption of the necessity to address

and alleviate current suffering in a task group, before focusing on task goals (Kanov, et al.,

2004). Utilization can also contribute to individual employees' and the organization's problem-

solving ability (Austin & Villanova, 1992). By generating appropriate emotional contexts,

organizations can assist in assist in making sure employees' decision-making fits the

organization's assumptions. For example, if an organization has an assumption about the

importance of compassion, it will then encourage the use of compassion during decision-making.

To illustrate, an insurance company might direct its employees to make decisions in a specific

way during a disaster, such as not requiring the usual forms as evidence for claims or using

rubrics to process claims less individualistically and more expediently thereby providing a more

compassionate response that recognizes special circumstances that might overrule regular

auditing requirements. Clearly a belief or assumption regarding the importance of using

emotions to enhance decision-making (e.g., Martin, Knopoff, & Beckman, 1998) illustrates an organization's integration of emotional utilization into its core assumptions.

Assumptions and emotion management. Emotional management involves acknowledgement of the importance of engaging or disengaging from emotions depending on their usefulness in any given situation for the organization (Mayer & Salovey, 1997). One core belief that integrates cultural assumptions with emotional management is a belief in the benefits of proactively developing an environment where appropriately managed emotions can enhance organizational life. This provides a linkage between compassion and emotional intelligence-culture in that compassion stimulates action in an attempt to help others alleviate their grief and suffering in cases of organizational failures (Shepherd, 2003).

At the assumptions level, therefore, using bounded emotionality logic implies people move beyond mere acceptance of emotions and suggests the organizational members develop assumptions about the benefits of modeling, managing, and integrating appropriate emotional expression to achieve work outcomes. Using again an organizational change process, or at another time when employees' jobs may be insecure (e.g., economic recession), organizational decision-makers in such an organization would understand that there is a significant potential for extreme emotions to be generated. Indeed, the need for organizations to deal with the emotions that emerge during change is a primary determinant of the organization's success or failure of change (Huy, 1999; Shepherd, 2003).

In support of this idea, research has established that a range of heightened emotions is experienced by employees as responses to a merger (Kiefer, 2002), which includes responding to a variety of affective events (e.g., work tasks, social relationships, relationships with the organization, and the personal situation of the employee). Similarly, Smollan and colleagues

(2006) examined a range of emotional responses to change and reported that change managers and the context of the organization were key determinants of employees' emotional responses. We argue therefore that organizations that develop a set of assumptions around the idea that a climate of compassion can be sustained during change should realize substantial short-term and long-term benefits.

Espoused Values Level of Culture

Organizations in their espoused values typically express preferences for certain behaviors or outcomes, such as emphasizing the importance of maintaining satisfied customers, treating all with dignity and respect, or showing compassion in its dealings. Often, however, there is a mismatch of espoused values and actual behavior (Argyris & Schön, 1974). Simpson and Cacioppe (2001) attribute this difference in actual behavior and espoused values as arising from "unwritten ground rules." An organization that values compassion and utilizes emotional intelligence abilities would be identified by espoused values *that are in concert with actual behaviors,* as reflected in vision, mission, and goal statements that incorporate and place priority on compassion. As well, the culture valuing compassion and emotion skills and abilities would have complementary enacted values reflected in the use of artifacts such as mottos, logos, and slogans that incorporate and place priority on emotional values such as compassion.

Espoused values and emotional awareness. As Härtel and Ashkanasy (2010) note, organizations that value emotions make value statements to stress the importance of monitoring the organization's affective climate. Value statements might articulate the need for awareness of individuals' own emotions, awareness of others' emotions, and awareness of the collective emotional climate. Although individuals may experience emotions automatically and may not be conscious of them (Bargh & Chartrand, 1999), by explicitly stating in a value statement that the

organization values emotional awareness, individual emotion awareness should be triggered. To build compassionate organizations, therefore, espoused values need to emphasize compassion, which can be achieved through heightened emotional awareness. Also, as an espoused value, organizations that value awareness of compassion and emotion may spend time and money to incorporate these into the basic processes that build their organization: recruitment, selection, and training and development.

This idea is supported by Schneider's (1987) attraction-selection-attrition model, which suggests that strong organizations will attract certain individuals who match their culture, and the individuals who fit best stay and prosper in the organizational environment, while those who don't, either select themselves out or are forced out. Thus, organizations attempting to build compassion would use artifacts to reflect underlying assumptions and values, hoping to attract and recruit individuals who also value compassion and emotion skills.

More recently, Daus and Cage (2006) argued for the importance of an emotion-specific job analysis utilizing an emotions framework within each level of training needs assessment, as necessary prior to recruitment and selection efforts. In this stage, organizational decision-makers set the stage for emotion work within specific jobs through a thorough assessment of the emotion skills necessary. They then build into their recruitment and selection processes, emphases on compassion and emotion skills. These emphases may be reflected in organizational artifacts such as company literature (websites, brochures), job postings, and job descriptions for recruitment; and selection hurdles such as a trait affect scale or emotional intelligence abilities test (all or only specific branches).

Also, an organizational value of emotional awareness could be reflected in training and development opportunities organizations provide for employees that emphasize the primary

importance of emotional abilities (e.g., see Daus & Cage, 2006). We see training as offering evidence for both the value and artifact level of culture. In particular, at the artifact level of culture, we focus on the outcomes from training efforts that would be reflected in the observable behaviors of employees. At the value level, training reflects things the organization values and is willing to invest considerable time and money on. As well, mentoring and career planning that integrate emotional skills and abilities, particularly awareness, would be exemplary in illustrating successful integration of emotional skills within organizations across the employees' organizational life-span. Organizations could provide developmental opportunities such as participating in 360° feedback that includes clients', employees', supervisors', peers' and self-assessments and feedback regarding use of emotional skills. These assessments should help emphasize the importance of being aware of how others respond to one emotionally, as well as awareness of how the employees' own emotions impact her/himself.

Espoused values and emotional knowledge. While valuing awareness is a necessary first level for organizations wishing to model compassion and emotional skills, it by definition stops short. Since compassion connotes action, simply being aware of how an individuals' emotions contribute to a compassionate (or not) response would not do much toward translating compassion into action. Thus the values and emotional knowledge linkage would move the organization more toward active behaviors and responses. A demonstration of how emotional knowledge is valued would be reflected in statements and actions that promote the development of emotional knowledge though reflection on and unpacking of events. While reflection and evaluation are time-consuming activities in organizations, an organization that values and utilizes compassion and emotional skills would encourage time spent on such activities that increased emotional knowledge in the organization.

Espoused values and emotional utilization. Valuing using emotions goes beyond simply valuing having knowledge about them or understanding them (Schein, 1990). Valuing the use of emotions would be akin to empowering employees to go one step further beyond understanding the affective climate of situations and organizational events and life: it would entail action. Once again, we see the link between emotional intelligence and compassion, as compassion intrinsically involves action.

For instance, the Fortune 500 organization *HCA*, which is a holding company for hospitals includes as a value statement, "We treat all those we serve with compassion and kindness."[1] Clearly, this reflects a priority of this company to use compassion and kindness, presumably in a way that facilitates beneficial outcomes for their patients. Similarly, yet illustrating the importance of valuing compassion expression with employees and not just clients, *Merck Medco Rx*, also a Fortune 500 company, states under one of their three key values (leadership, integrity, teamwork) that leaders need to lead by "showing compassion" (among other things). Although the visible actions that are performed by these companies and leaders within the companies are the true test regarding whether or not a company is enacting what it espouses, we argue that these examples of integrating compassion into an organization's value statements reflects deeply held values of using compassion in these organizations.

Espoused values and emotion management. Empathy and compassionate support imply a recursive element within their very mention; by this we mean that it is difficult to imagine *using* empathy or compassionate support without the target person first exhibiting some emotional situation or need that implicates the level of support or empathy required. Clearly,

---

[1] From http://tampasharedservices.com/CustomPage.asp?guidCustomContentID=53432C19-AD52-427F-BC03-E7C49A646CEC, accessed Oct 29, 2010.

such behavioral manifestations indicate that there is some need of someone whereby the use empathy and/or support might be a way for you to manage their emotions – you offer a shoulder to cry on - and/or to help the target to manage her or his own emotions – you offer tangible support which helps relieve anxiety and stress.

As a further example, employees who value emotionally expressivity (i.e., a balance between extreme suppression or expression) should also be expected to build emotion management into performance and reward structures in the organization (Ashkanasy & Daus, 2002). This echoes our earlier discussion of emotional labor (Hochschild, 1983) in that it is the ability to manage between appropriate expression and suppression of emotion that should be valued as reflected in corporate performance reviews and subsequent monetary and non-monetary rewards (e.g., customer service recognition awards and ceremonies). Perhaps nowhere is this management of emotions more important than in agencies such as hospices, whose espoused mission and values would certainly include showing compassion and caring for the suffering and dying. One way to do this is to help patients manage their emotions. In this respect, Gibson and Schroder (2001) noted that, "Caregivers can use their own behaviors to lessen the pain and suffering of the dying patient" (p. 22).

While hospice agencies represent a select type of organization where compassion and management of emotion are a primary focus, other work supports that maintaining relationships within the organization hinges on emotional management. Martin et al. (1998), for example, noted that the performance benefits of bounded emotionality emerge from underlying emotions within an organization being brought to a surface level of awareness and being appropriately managed. While this strategy could result in conflict that is difficult to manage, Martin and her colleagues contend that these emotions if carefully selected, controlled, and managed can

enhance relationships and consequently enhance the productivity of an organization. This has clear implications for how organizations develop their recruitment, selection, and rewards structures.

Artifacts Level of Culture

The artifact level of organizational culture is the most visible (Schein, 1990). Artifacts are intended to convey a particular message or feel of the organization and, if aligned with values, can often reflect the organization's deeply held assumptions. Organizations wishing to develop, to sustain, and to model compassion, then, need to make certain that the three levels of culture align with each other.

Emotions, in-and-of themselves, can be artifacts of an organization when they become inextricably linked (intentionally and explicitly) to the organization. For instance, happiness is linked to organizations such as McDonalds (Han, 2009) and Disney (Van Maanen & Kunda, 1989); caring and compassion are linked to Healthcare organizations (Turkel & Ray, 2004); threats, fear/intimidation, and aggression to military organizations (Garsombke, 1988); and distrust and hostility for debt collectors (Hochschild, 1983). The point here is that emotions (both positive and negative) are core artifacts of organizations and it is the utility of those emotions and what they tell the outside world about that organization that makes these emotions important.

As we discussed earlier, artifacts are akin to enacted or operating values which are reflected in organizational goals, philosophies, and strategies, or their espoused values (Schein, 1990). Artifacts are more commonly evident in the signs an organization promotes such as arrangement of branding, use and arrangement of organizational space, norms of behavior, logos, slogans, and mottos. Organizations utilizing emotions effectively would make certain that the

image that is projected by their corporate logo, slogans and mottos is the one that represent how they want the public to perceive them.

The role that artifacts can and do play in an organization's life, and subsequent success or failure has recently been under much academic scrutiny, led by Rafaeli and her colleagues (e.g., see Rafaeli & Pratt, 2006; Rafaeli & Vilnai-Yavetz, 2004). For example, Rafaeli and Pratt (2006) argue that artifacts reassert the integration of sensory experiences into organizational life; or those ways of knowing outside of traditional cognition that are shaped by emotions and feeling states. Further, in a qualitative investigation of the intersection between emotions toward organizational artifacts and feelings about the organization itself (in a large public transportation organization; examining the color green on the buses), Rafaeli and Vilnai-Yavetz (2004) discovered that there was a link between organizational artifacts (and the emotions they aroused) and emotion and attitudes toward the organization. Thus, we examine the role of emotions regarding processing of organizational artifacts that determine perceptions about the organization.

Artifacts and emotional awareness. Applying bounded emotionality theory, we argue that this implies that emotions are an undercurrent within an organization and that emotions need both to be displayed (raised to a surface level of awareness), and to be relationally managed (management branch of EI), in order for the organization to be successful. The first step in this process, however, is for organizations to be aware of the emotional climate that exists in the organization and to take steps to maintain awareness of this climate.

Organizations with a culture of high awareness of others' emotions, would be much more likely to take frequently the critical first step of the compassion process: noticing or being aware of another's suffering (Lilius, et al., 2008) than those without such an emphasis. Kanov and

colleagues (2004) give several specific examples of organizational artifacts that represent a high

awareness of the value of compassion, such as arranging office spaces to be more open (to be

able to notice others' emotions), as well as one hospital going so far as to publish a monthly

Caring Times newsletter devoted to stories regarding the compassion acts of its employees (see

Kanov, et al., 2004; p. 820).

In the medical community, moreover, awareness of emotions and emotional expression is

critical for proper pain assessment (Soetenga, Frank, Pellino, 1999), rooted in Ekman's (1982;

2003) facial expressions of emotions work. Proper pain assessment, concomitantly, is crucial for

enabling a compassionate response to alleviate the suffering. Thus, artifacts, such as methods of

pain assessment and the existence of training opportunities for how to use patient emotional

expression to assess pain, would indicate an organization's underlying values on compassion and

emotional awareness. Compassionate and emotionally aware nurses, doctors and hospice

workers would therefore be expected to be skilled at these aspects of emotional awareness,

including watching patients for signs of pain expressed in faces and body language; noticing

apparent incongruities between verbal expression of pain and facial/body language; and

understanding when to use alternative methods (rather than patient verbal reports), for pain

assessment such as visual expressions of pain on a pain scale, or patient body language. Such

situations would include those who are non-verbal, for example, infants and cultural minorities,

who may not understand the language well; patients who are cognitive developmentally

impaired; and those in too much pain to be able to voice it effectively and accurately (Ware,

Epps, Herr & Packard, 2006). Relieving pain is so much a core aspect of compassion that we

can extend the notion of relieving physical pain, to relieving other types of pain and suffering in

organizations. We noted above that Kanov and colleagues (2004) argue about the importance of

acknowledging and alleviating pain and suffering in peer work groups and reemphasize its relevance and importance here.

      Artifacts and emotional knowledge. As discussed earlier in the values and emotional awareness section, organizations that value emotional knowledge should be expected to build emotional knowledge and skills into their recruitment, selection, and training. Reflected as artifacts in organizations, these values would emerge as time spent in the organization to build up their understanding of emotional reactions within the organization. Developing knowledge regarding the utility of emotion through training (Daus & Cage, 2006) and coaching (Boyatzis, et al., 2006) would result in an increased understanding of how the organizational environment contributes to a specific affective climate. In relation to compassion, this training and development would therefore involve understanding how compassion can be triggered and the typical events that might require a compassionate response, as well as options of compassionate responses that might prove effective in that situation. Thus, just as different employees are likely to be motivated differently, so do compassionate responses need to vary to be effective (Lilius, et al., 2008). Some employees may just want emotional support while others may need a more practical intervention, like an offer of help or a proposed solution to their problem. Taking time to gain this type of knowledge, and sharing can thus be seen to be an artifact.

      Emotional knowledge at an organizational level is essential for organizations undergoing change (Härtel & Ashkanasy, 2010). For instance, in selecting the timing of the implementation of a change program, organizations make decisions based on emotional knowledge about providing employees with a stress buffer. We note further that organizations often will advance or retard change plans on the basis of other commitments such as end of financial year or holidays to enable employees to focus on their work during these peak periods. Furthermore, an

organization that considers itself, or wants to be, compassionate, might delay the change plans not for productivity reasons so much, but for purely compassionate reasons.

Artifacts and emotional utilization. At this level of culture, appropriate reflections of emotion use would be expected to build visibly on known information (discussed earlier) regarding affect and decision-making, and setting the appropriate affective climate for projects. We see organizations utilizing tangible efforts to promote discrete emotions like happiness, for example, through enjoyable extracurricular corporate activities such as charitable drives, sports teams, happy hours, etc… to set a positive affective climate for the organization. In the case of building a compassionate organization, similar tangible efforts to promote positive emotions should enable individuals to use these emotions to generate compassionate behaviors.

As indicated previously, cultural values may be expressed through visible artifacts. Facilitation and use of compassion may emerge in artifacts of the décor, type of furniture, color schemes, and layout of the workspaces (e.g., see Rafaeli & Vilnai-Yavetz, 2004). As such, to promote a compassionate workplace, organizations might provide support groups, space for informal gatherings and privacy, and encourage employees to foster strong social network support groups within the workplace. In addition, the organizational artifacts of dress codes (uniforms) and public eating rituals (e.g., see Martin & Siehl, 1983) may also promote compassionate feelings for others.

Artifacts that reflect compassionate values should also be seen to evoke the emotion of compassion in employees by linking these emotions to the work context. As Rafaeli and Vilnai-Yavetz (2004) explain, emotion that surfaces in sense-making of organizational artifacts may be what links interpretation of artifacts and attitudes toward organizations. We build on this view by suggesting that the emotional intelligence branch of facilitation is what allows individuals to

accomplish this goal. Individuals high on ability to use emotions should be more adept at

interpreting the artifacts and using the aroused emotion to guide their actions through attitude

formation. Organizational cultures are dynamic (Hatch, 1993), so this is an ongoing process

requiring high levels of emotion facilitation if emotions associated with the artifacts are to have

any real impact in employees.

Artifacts and emotional management. Consistent with bounded emotionality (Mumby

& Putnam, 1992) and emotional labor theory (Hochschild, 1983), being able to regulate and to

manage emotions is an essential requirement at the organizational level. We believe that this

management level of EI within a bounded emotionality framework would be reflected in surface

artifacts of cohesive teams/groups using conflict effectively to resolve problems (De Dreu, & van

Knippenberg, 2005) and communicating well. Behavioral norms would thus be established in

relation to the expression and suppression of specific emotions. For instance organizational

display rules around showing compassion to customers in resolving complaints may result in

better customer service and a reputation for excellent customer relations.

From an organizational perspective, consideration of bounded emotionality suggests there

can be benefits gained from assisting employees to regulate their emotions. This form of

emotional management of others can result from either positive or negative emotions. Managing

others' emotions may also involve the ability to assist others to overcome frustration or negative

experiences particularly during organizational change episodes. Organizations that are able to

manage these emotions effectively provide a working environment that encourages the

identification of negative emotion and then turn that emotion into a motivating force. They may

do this through emotional contagion by adopting an optimistic and encouraging demeanor and

generating enthusiasm for the challenge, rather than dwelling on the frustration (Barsade, 2002).

An organization's use of space (discussed earlier) can also be an artifact that reflects emotional management as an important value. As an example of intentionally designing space in an attempt to convey a compassionate response, an organization could provide a lactation room for nursing mothers, who are often anxious about trying to balance a professional life and still being able to nurse. In an attempt to help nursing mothers manage the anxiety that accompanies this work-family balance stressor, organizations could provide a private room that is attractively decorated with calming colors (as contrasted with, say, no provided private space whatsoever; York, 2008).   This would send a message to all employees that employees' family life and well-being are valued, and that the organization cares about actively doing something to help alleviate working mothers' anxiety. Indeed, by some this is considered to be an organizational best practice that "offers comfort and respect for mothers" (York, 2008, p. 1).

Related to organizational change, an example of an organizational artifact reflecting the value of effective emotion management can be seen in how the organization handles communications regarding the change. As a case-in-point, Schweiger and DeNisi (1991) discuss an organization undergoing a merger that had a culture that wanted to express caring, supportiveness, and compassion to the employees, and did so through quite creative means (e.g., a merger hotline; holding informational meetings about the merger; ensuring job security). Furthermore, such sessions could serve as an artifact to reinforce the organization's compassionate culture, through its responses to change and its open acknowledgement that emotions need to be dealt with during change. This aspect of compassion, the necessary action/response linkage to the emotion, would serve as the visible artifacts of both effective management of emotions, as well as organizational compassion.

LIMITATIONS AND CONTRIBUTIONS

In this article, we sought to provide a theoretical framework for emotions research to be integrated with organizational culture, with a focus on enabling compassion to develop in organizations. We note the lack of research evidence in this area that resulted in conclusions at the macro level (i.e., the organization), from research based at the individual or group level, is problematic (Ashkanasy, 2003). Nonetheless, while this is not optimal, we note that other compassion researchers theoretically (e.g., Dutton et al., 2006; Kanov, et al., 2004), and empirically (Lilius, et al., 2008), have conceptually aggregated individual level variables to the organizational cultural level.

We acknowledge this as a limitation to our framework, but draw on Yammarino and Dansereau's (2010) conceptualization of multilevel issues and note these authors highlight the "embeddedness" of levels which suggests that true understanding of cultural phenomena need consider how the different levels interact and integrate. We identify our perspective as in line with what they call "an emergent wholes formation" (Yammarino & Dansereau, 2010; p. 54) where relationships exhibited at lower levels (e.g., individual; group) are expected to hold at higher levels (e.g., organization). We concede the necessity of testing this assumption empirically.

Furthermore, we highlight that our approach reflects thought regarding organizational compassion and note Kanov and colleagues' thoughts on this issue, that, "… organizational compassion involves a set of social processes in which noticing, feeling, and responding to pain are shared among a set of organizational members." (p. 816). While we did not set out to resolve this conundrum, we consider the framework we have outlined as contributing to our understanding of the links between culture and emotion; and more directly relevant to this

special issue, that this framework can be used to help generate more compassionate organizations.

In conclusion, we have presented a theoretical model of organizational compassion that integrates emotional intelligence and organizational culture. Although other scholars have previously linked emotions and organizational culture, we are the first, to our knowledge, to specify how emotional intelligence can contribute to organizational culture formation in this way. Our central contribution lies in our 3x4 (culture x emotional intelligence abilities) matrix framework which indicates how specific emotional intelligence branches can direct, guide, and shape emotions at the organizational culture level to create a compassionate organization. Theories of bounded emotionality, emotional labor, and affective events provide support for our proposed arguments at the individual, group, and organizational levels of analysis. Such theoretical support is necessary for our model, as developing a compassionate organization involves a translation of individual and group level emotions into collective action. Our intent is to promote long-term employee well-being through compassionate organizational cultures, and we believe that emotional intelligence is an ability that organizations can utilize to achieve this desirable outcome. We call for future research to test the proposed linkages in this model, and to demonstrate empirically the translation of emotion into compassionate action through integrating emotional intelligence and organizational culture.

References

Ashforth, B. E. & Humphrey, R. H. 1995. Emotion in the workplace: A reappraisal. *Human Relations*, 48: 97-125.

Ashkanasy, N. M. 2003. Emotions in organizations: A multi-level perspective. *Multi-level issues in Organizational Behavior and Strategy*, 2: 9-54.

Ashkanasy, N. M., & Daus, S. D. 2002. Emotion in the Workplace: The New Challenge for Managers. *Academy of Management Executive*, *16*(1): 76-86.

Ashkanasy, N. M., & Nicholson, G. J. 2003. Climate of fear in organizational settings: Construct definition, measurement, and a test of theory. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 55: 24-29.

Argyris, C. & Schön, D. 1974. *Theory in practice: Increasing professional effectiveness*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Austin, J. T., & Villanova, P. 1992. The criterion problem:1917–1992. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77: 836 – 874.

Bargh, J. A., & Chartrand, T. L. 1999. The unbearable automaticity of being. *American Psychologist*, 54: 462-479.

Barsade, S. G. 2002. The ripple effect: Emotional contagion and its influence on group behavior. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 47: 644–675.

Beyer, J., & Niño, D. 2001. Culture as a source, expression, and reinforcer of emotions in organizations. In R. L. Payne & C. L. Cooper (eds). *Emotions at work: Theory, research, and applications for management:* 173-197. Chichester, UK: Wiley.

Boyatzis, R., Smith, M., & Blaize, N. 2006. Developing sustainable leaders through coaching and compassion. *Academy of Management Learning & Education*, 5: 8-24.

Cannon, W. B. 1932. *The wisdom of the body*. New York: Norton.

Cherniss, C. 2001. Emotional intelligence and organizational effectiveness. In C. Cherniss & D. Goleman (Eds.), *The emotionally intelligent workplace* (pp. 3-26). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Daus, C. S. & Cage, T. 2008. Learning to face emotional intelligence:training and workplace

applications. In N. M. Ashkanasy & C. L. Cooper (Eds.). *Research Companion to*

Emotion in Organizations, pp. 245-260. Northampton, MA:

Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.

De Dreu, C. K. W., & van Knippenberg, D. 2005. The possessive self as a barrier to conflict

resolution: Effects of mere ownership, process accountability, and self-concept clarity on

competitive cognitions and behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*,

89(3): 345–357.

Denison, D. R. 1996. What is the difference between organizational culture and organizational

climate? A native's point of view on a decade of paradigm wars. *Academy of*

Management Review, 21(3): 619-654.

Diefendorff, , Morehart, J., & Gabriel, A. 2010. The influence of power and solidarity on

emotional display rules at work. *Motivation and Emotion*, 34 (2): 120-132.

Diefendorff, J. M., & Richard, E. M. 2003. Antecedents and consequences of emotional display

rule perceptions. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88: 284-294.

Diefendorff, J. M., Richard, E. M., & Croyle, M. H. 2006. Are emotional display rules formal

job requirements? Examination of employee and supervisor perceptions. *Journal of*

Occupational and Organizational Psychology, 79: 273-298.

Dutton, J. E., Worline, M. C., Frost, P. J. & Lilius, J. M. 2006. Explaining compassion

organizing. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 51: 59-96.

Ekman, P. 1982. *Emotion in the Human Face*, 2nd Ed. Cambridge: Cambridge

University Press

Ekman, P. 2003. *Emotions Revealed: Recognizing Faces and Feelings to Improve Communication and Emotional Life*. New York: Holt.

Elfenbein, H. A. 2007. Emotion in organizations: A review and theoretical integration. In J. P. Walsh & A. P. Brief (Eds.), *The Academy of Management Annals* (Vol. 1, pp. 315-386). Amsterdam: Elsevier.

Fineman, S. 2000. *Emotion in organizations*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Fineman, S. 2001. Emotions and organizational control. In R. L. Payne & C. L. Cooper (eds). *Emotions at work: Theory, research, and applications for management*: 219-240. Chichester, UK: Wiley.

Fitness, J. 2000. Anger in the workplace: An emotion script approach to anger episodes between workers and their superiors, co-workers, and subordinates. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21, 147-162.

Frost, P. J., Dutton, J. E., Worline, M. C., & Wilson, A. 2000. Narratives of compassion in organizations. In S. Fineman (Ed.), *Emotion in organizations*: (2nd ed.) 25– 45. London: Sage.

Garsombke, D. J. 1988. Organizational culture dons the mantle of militarism. *Organizational Dynamics*, 17(1): 46-56.

Gibson, M. C., & Schroder, C. 2001. The many faces of pain for older, dying adults. *American Journal of Hospice and Palliative Care*, 18(1): 19-25.

 Gladkova, A. 2010. A linguist's view of "pride". *Emotion Review*, 2(2):178–179.

Goetz, J. L., Keltner, D., & Simon-Thomas, E. 2010. Compassion: An evolutionary analysis and empirical review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 136: 351-374.

Grandey, A. A. 2003. When ''the show must go on:'' Surface acting and deep acting as determinants of emotional exhaustion and peer-rated service delivery. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 46: 86-95.

Han, J. 2008. The business strategy of McDonald's. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 3 (11): 72 -74.

Hareli, S., & Rafaeli, A. 2008. Emotion cycles: On the social influence of emotion in organizations. In B. M. Staw & A. P. Brief (eds.), *Research in organizational behavior*, vol. 28: 35-59). Oxford, UK: Elsevier Press.

Härtel, C. E. J., & Ashkanasy, N. M. 2010. Healthy human cultures as positive work environments. In N. M. Ashkanasy, C. E. P. Wilderom, & M. F. Peterson (Eds.), *The handbook of culture and climate, Second edition*: 85-100. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage.

Hatch, M. J. 1993. The dynamics of organizational culture. *Academy of Management Review*, 18: 657–693.

Hatfield, E., Cacioppo, J. T., & Rapson, R. L. 1993. Emotional contagion. *Current Directions in Psychological Science*, 2: 96-99.

Hochschild, A. R. 1983. *The managed heart: Commercialization of human feeling*. Los Angeles: University of California Press.

Huy, Q. N. 1999. Emotional capacity, emotional intelligence, and radical change. *Academy of Management Review*, 24: 325-345.

Huy, Q. N. 2002. Emotional balancing of organizational continuity and radical change: The contribution of middle managers. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 47: 31–69.

Joseph, D. L., & Newman, D. A. 2010. Emotional intelligence: An integrative meta-analysis and cascading model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 95(1): 54-78.

Kanov, J. M., Maitlis, S., Worline, M. C., Dutton, J. E., Frost, P. J. & Lilius, J. M. 2004. Compassion in organizational life. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 47: 808-827.

Kiefer, T. 2002. Understanding the emotional experience of organizational change: Evidence from a merger. *Advances in Developing Human Resources*, 4: 39-61.

Lilius, J. M., Worline, M. C., Maitlis, S., Kanov, J., Dutton, J. E. & Frost, P. 2008. The contours and consequences of compassion at work. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 29: 193-218.

Linley, P. A., Joseph, S., Harrington, S., & Wood, A. M. 2006. Positive psychology: Past, present, and (possible) future. *The Journal of Positive Psychology*, 1: 3–16.

Martin, J., Knopoff, K., & Beckman, C. 1998. An alternative to bureaucratic impersonality and emotional labor: Bounded emotionality at The Body Shop. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 43: 429-469.

Martin, J., & Siehl, C. 1983. Organizational culture and counterculture: An uneasy symbiosis, *Organizational Dynamics*, 12 (2): 52-64.

Mayer, J. D., & Salovey, P. 1997. What is Emotional Intelligence? In P. Salovey & D. J. Sluyter (Eds.), *Emotional development and emotional intelligence: Educational implications* (pp. 3-31). New York: Basic Books.

Mayer, J.D., Caruso, D., & Salovey, P. 1999. Emotional intelligence meets traditional standards for an intelligence. *Intelligence*, 27: 267-298.

McGregor, D. 1960. *The human side of enterprise*, McGraw-Hill.

Mischel, W., & DeSmet, A. L. 2000. Self-regulation in the service of conflict resolution. *The handbook of conflict resolution: theory and practice* , 256-275. (M. Deutsch, & P. T. Coleman, Eds.) San Francisco, CA: John Wiley & Sons.

Mumby, D. K., & Putnam, L. A. 1992. The politics of emotion: A feminist reading of bounded rationality. *Academy of Management Review*, 17: 465-486.

Newcombe, M. J. & Ashkanasy, N. M. 2002. The role of affect and affective congruence in perceptions of leaders: An experimental study. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 13: 601-614.

Rafaeli, A. & Pratt, M. 2006. *Artifacts and organizations: Beyond mere symbolism*. LEA: Mahwah, NJ.

Rafaeli, A. & Sutton, R. I. 1987. Expression of emotion as part of the work role. *Academy of Management Review*, 12: 23-37.

Rafaeli, A. & Vilnai-Yavetz, I. 2004. Emotion as a connection of physical artifacts and organizations. *Organizational Science*, 15(6): 671-686.

Schaubroeck, J., & Jones, J. R. 2000. Antecedents of workplace emotional labor dimensions and moderators of their effects on physical symptoms. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 21: 163-183.

Schein, E. H. 1990. Organizational culture: The changing face and place of work. *American Psychologist*, 45(2): 109-119.

Schweiger, D. M. & DeNisi, A. S. 1991. Communication with employees following a merger: A longitudinal field experiment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 34(1): 110-135.

Schneider, B. 1987. The people make the place. *Personnel Psychology*, 40: 437-453.

Shepherd, D. A. 2003. Learning from business failure: Propositions about the grief recovery process for the self-employed. *Academy of Management Review*, 28(2): 318-329.

Simpson, S. & Cacioppe, R. 2001. Unwritten ground rules: transforming organization culture to achieve key business objectives and outstanding customer service. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 22: 394-401.

Smollan, R. K. 2006. Minds, hearts and deeds: cognitive, affective and behavioral responses to change. *Journal of Change Management*, 6: 143-158.

Soetenga, D., Frank, J. & Pellino, T. A. 1999. Practice applications of research. Assessment of the validity and reliability of the University of Wisconsin Children's Hospital Pain Scale for Preverbal and Nonverbal Children. *Pediatric Nursing*, 25(6): 670-676.

Turkel, M. C. & Ray, M. A. 2004. Creating a caring practice environment through self-renewal. *Nursing Administration Quarterly*, 28 (4): 249-254.

Van Maanen, J. & Kunda, G. 1989. Real feelings: Emotional expressions and organization culture. In B. Staw and L.L. Cummings (eds.) *Research in Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 11.Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, 43-102.

Vandenabeele, W. 2009. The mediating effect of job satisfaction and organizational commitment on self-reported performance: more robust evidence of the PSM— performance relationship. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 75: 11-34.

Von Dietze, E. & Orb, A. 2000. Compassionate care: A moral dimension of nursing. *Nursing Inquiry*, 7: 166-174.

Ware, L. J., Epps, C. D., Herr, K., & Packard, A. 2006. Evaluation of the Revised Faces Pain Scale, Verbal Descriptor Scale, Numeric Rating Scale, and Iowa Pain Thermometer in Older Minority Adults. *Pain Management Nursing*, 7(3): 117-125.

Weiss, H. M., & Cropanzano, R. 1996. Affective events theory: A theoretical discussion of the structure, causes and consequences of affective experiences at work. In B. M. Staw & L. L. Cummings (Eds.), *Research in Organizational Behavior*, vol. 18: 1-74. Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.

Yammarino, F. J., & Dansereau, F. 2010. Multilevel Issues in Organizational Culture and

   Climate Research. In 2. Ashkanasy, N.M., Wilderom, C. P. M., & Peterson, M. F. (in

   press). *Introduction to the Handbook of Culture and Climate*, Second Edition. In N.

   M.Ashkanasy, C. E. P. Wilderom, & M. F. Peterson (Eds.), The Handbook of Culture and

   Climate (Second Ed., pp. 50-76). Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

York, L. 2008. Lactation room design. *AIA Best Practices,* February, 1-2.